



Talk on Anarchism

Talk on Anarchism

Belgrade 2008

Impressum

Publication:

Talk on Anarchism

Publisher:

Group for Logistical Support
<http://glp.anarhija.org>

Editorial, transcription, translation, design and layout and proof reading:

Group for Logistical Support and friends

Printed by:

Akademija, Belgrade, September 2008

Print run:

600

GLP thanks to X-Y Solidarity Fund that helped to publish this reader.



SOLIDARITY FUND

De Wittenstraat 43-45 | 1052AL Amsterdam
The Netherlands | www.xminy.nl

Content

- 5 **Introduction**
- 7 **Contemporary Tendencies in Anarchism**
Misha Mashina, Dražen Šimleša, Marko Strpić
- 40 **Difficulties in Articulating Anarchafeminism as a Position of Action or as a Theoretical and Political Movement**
Sanja Petkovska
- 46 **Feminism and Anarchism**
Vanda Perović
- 49 **Erasing of Context Through Hyper-Production**
Vladan Jeremić
- 54 **Our ideas are in everybody's minds**
Sezgin Boynik
- 57 **Stani Pani Kolektiv**
Igor Todorović
- 61 **Monteparadiso**
Edgar Buršić
- 64 **Kritički mediji u Nemačkoj**
Boris Kanzleiter
- 67 **Introduction in 19th-century Anarchism in Russia**
Misha Mashina
- 69 **Strategies of political struggle, violence and non-violence**
Silke Maier-Witt, Dragan Ambrozić
- 81 **Horizontalidad, Autonomy and New Subjectivity in Argentina: What makes something Anarchist?**
Marina Sitrin
- 84 **Notes on Post-Anarchism**
Süreyya Evren
- 90 **Postanarchismus im deutschsprachigen Raum¹**
Jürgen Mümken
- 98 **Interview with Activists of Freedom Fight**
Andrej Grubačić
- 106 **Conversation with Brener and Schurz**

1 no English translation available

Introduction

The reader *Talk on Anarchism* came out as a result of ten debates on anarchism held between May 2006 and May 2007 at the Cultural Center Dom omladine in Belgrade. It publishes in Serbo-Croatian and English transcripts of the held discussions that were edited by the participants. Additional materials are texts by several guests participants: GLP (The Group for Logistical Support) as a publisher thanks Marina Sitrin, Jürgen Mümken, Sureyya Evren, Andrej Grubačić and the collective Freedom Fight for their contributions.

The *Group for Logistical Support* (GLP, Grupa za logističku podršku) is a voluntary initiative, which was founded in February 2006 in Belgrade to bring up issues about social activism and anarchism and to discuss them in broader communities and contexts.

Between May 2006 and May 2007 the Group for Logistical Support organized ten debates titled *Talk on Anarchism* with speakers from Serbia, Croatia, Turkey and Germany at the Cultural Center Dom omladine in Belgrade. The discussions collected different directions of thinking and practice. Sometimes these discussions lasted up to three hours with an actively involved audience of more than hundred people. There was no specific selection promoted and participation was offered to all existing groups and individuals to show up the variety of standpoints with the idea to strengthen the ties between activists. All discussions have been audio recorded with the aim to be published in cooperation with the participants. Together with the printed and pdf reader, sound and photo material is accessible as well on the GLP web site: <http://glp.anarhija.org>

The reader comprises parts of transcripts of the following discussions:

8. 5. 2006, Historical Introduction to Anarchism

Speaker: Trivo Indić (Historian, Belgrade)

15. 5. 2006, Contemporary Tendencies in Anarchism

Speakers: Dražen Šimleša (ZMAG, author of the book “Snaga utopije”, Zagreb), Marko Strpić (Organisator of ASK, Anarchist book fair, Zagreb and editor of „Što čitaš?”), Misha Mashina (Zluradi Paradi Collective, Belgrade)

1. 6. 2006, Anarchism - Feminism

Speakers: Vanda Perović (Womens' studies, Belgrade), Sanja Petkovska (Belgrade), Milica Gudović (Feminist Collective Women at Work, Belgrade).

16. 6. 2006, Anarcho-Syndicalism

Speakers: Rudolf Mühland (Freie ArbeiterInnen Union, Düsseldorf), Petar Atanacković Kružok (Novi Sad), Ratibor Trivunac (ASI, Belgrade)

1. 10. 2006, Art and Anarchism

Speakers: Sezgin Boynik (Theorist, expert on Situationist International, Istanbul), Tadej Kurepa (Belgrade), Milica Ružičić (Artist, Belgrade), Vladan Jeremić (Cultural worker, artist and activist, Belgrade)

16. 10. 2006, Activism

Speakers: Edgar Buršić, (Monteparadiso, Pula, Croatia), Igor Todorović, (Stani Pani Collective Belgrade).

15. 11. 2006, Independent Media and Activism

Speakers: Pop (Kontrapunkt, Serbia, <http://kontra-punkt.info>), Boris Kanzleiter (Historian and independent journalist, publishes in Jungle World, Arranca!, itd., Berlin/ Belgrade), Violeta Anđelković (Indymedia Belgrade, Association for women's initiative AŽIN, Belgrade).

7. 12. 2006, Anarchism and Marxism - Historical Lessons

Speakers: Dragutin Leković (Marxist historian, Belgrade/Podgorica), Misha Mashina (Zluradi Paradi Collective, Belgrade)

9.05. 2007, Strategies of political struggle – Violence and Nonviolence

Speakers: Silke Maier Witt (Skopje), Dragan Ambrozić (Belgrade)

16. 05. 2007, Workers' self-management in Yugoslavia and the Ideas of Anarchism

Speakers: Sonja Drljević (Association for women's initiative AŽIN, Belgrade), Dragomir Olujić Oluja (Independent Journalist)

GLP (Miloš Rančić, Vladan Jeremić, Dragan Ambrozić, Milica Ružičić,) thanks all persons who were engaged within the project Talk on Anarchism: Mario Marić, Rena Rädle, Tijana Cvijetićanin, Misha Mashina and Sonja Drljević.

GLP thanks Dom omladine Belgrade for giving space, technical equipment and other logistic for the realization of Talk on Anarchism debates as an official program of Dom omladine.

GLP thanks Association for Women's Initiative AŽIN and all those collectives, organizations, and persons that put energy and helped to have this work visible and continual.

GLP thanks Misha Mashina, Nikola Mokrović, Sanja Pajović, Ana Piper and Vladimir Brašanac for work on proof-reading and translation.

GLP thanks x-y Solidarity Fund for financial support for publishing this reader.

Contemporary Tendencies in Anarchism

Misha Mashina, Dražen Šimleša, Marko Strpić

Sanja Petkovska: ...He will speak about some contemporary tendencies in the anarchist movement; he'll pose some questions about what's going on in the anarchist movement in relation to classical one, from the end of XIX century and the early XX century. There you go, Misha.

Misha Mashina: Thank you, Sanja. The things that I am going to talk about will be, in some way, related to the fact that Sanja has been named as 'hostess'. And if there are going to be some interventions – freely ask, I will try to talk as shortly as I could.

There are several things I'd like to mention. I assume – in fact I hope – that more talk will come later during the discussion or if I get interrupted, so I'll just lay down some basic ideas, basic theses of what is called 'postanarchism' today, and I hope that some of that could be explained in more detailed way during the discussion.

As a term, postanarchism appeared only in 2003. – or in 2002., I'm not so sure – but that theoretical line has been spreading already in the second half of nineties, above all else as a terminology, therefore in the academic circles. In that sense postanarchism is not something that can be seen in any kind of announcements, publications etc. of some concrete group or organization which calls itself anarchist, but I believe that what postanarchism has to offer is more than just critic of traditional anarchism and of that which anarchism was during the end of XIX century and the early XX, when it has been articulated as relevant answer to other alternatives, or leftist alternatives, to capitalist relations of production and the state. Postanarchism which appears as somewhat articulated theory at the end of nineties represents a mixture, or some kind of dialogue, between poststructuralist philosophy and traditional anarchism. As such, postanarchism is not encircled, it does not offer answers to Grand Questions, which are asked from all theories, but only brings to dialogue some crucial theses of poststructuralist philosophy which can... (a question from audience) Yes, yes.

Sanja: Questions can be posed at any time, just give me a sign and I'll come to you and you can ask your question... Just a moment, just a moment...

Ratibor Trivunac: Good day. I am interested – the poststructuralist philosophy, what does that mean, I don't have any idea? If someone could explain it a bit more.

Misha: Excellent question. Poststructuralism has a lot to do with ideas, so not having an idea about poststructuralism is a very good introduction to what poststructuralism actually is. So, poststructuralism is a philosophy which appeared in so called postmodernity, which is a condition of contemporary capitalist society, and which questioned all traditional values, ideas of progress, certainty, stable identities, etc. Poststructuralism could not be reduced to postmodernity. Poststructuralism is, in a way, critical philosophy which develops under postmodern condition.

Sanja: Sorry, Misha, we have one more question.

Misha: Sure.

Sanja: Anyone who poses a question please introduce yourself.

Trivunac: Ratibor Trivunac. 'Stable identities' – what does that mean?

Misha: Stable identities are, let's say, that on which the one who is asking about assumes he knows an answer. Stable identities are that which does not come into question. It's the position of an anarchist who knows what anarchism is, it's the position of a man who knows what it means to be Man; it's even position of, let's say, Serbian nationalist who completely knows what it means to be Serb. Those are stable identities that are not questioned, which are presumed, which are everywhere in media, in surrounding, in everyday speech. Those are stable identities. Other questions or should I continue?

So, poststructuralist philosophy in dialogue with traditional anarchism questions a lot of assumptions, or a lot of significant assumptions of traditional anarchism. Here I will present anarchism, the traditional one, above all else as an idea which challenges, of course, contemporary relations of production, and not only contemporary but all relations of production, economic relations of production, based on exploitation and domination. In this sense traditional anarchism is somehow ambiguous – or has both in it's works and practice – between considering political authority and domination as the source of all other dominations and, on the other side, has an idea that it is economic exploitation, or economic relations in society or relations of pro-

duction, that are root of all political institutions. But more about that later.

The things that are going to be problematized here and where the difference or continuity between postanarchism and traditional anarchism are going to be visible, are the question of individual and society, question of explaining the individual itself, and then relations between individual and power, and some kind of formulation of relation between individual and revolt, i.e. any everyday answer to actual condition. These are some aspects of traditional anarchism which I'll try to present through postanarchist point of view.

As for the understanding of individual and society, it is usually said that anarchism assumes that the human individual is in it's essence good, good by nature, etc., and that simply – if some conditions were not present – we could live this or that way, in solidarity or something like that. Anyway, traditional anarchism – and I rely mostly on Bakunin and Kropotkin – does not have that idea that human nature is good. In any case, it does not think that human nature is something contentually determined. So, it is not that we are by nature good and that some institution is constraining us.

However, the thing that traditional anarchism has in common with other traditional political philosophies is that question of trying to construct, that is explain the totality of the society. What makes us live in society anyway? All liberal and many conservative theories assume that there are various, both physically and mentally, separated individuals which engage in some kind of agreement or contract with others, on base of which they arrange society. So from the theory of social contract onward the main question has been if that institution, which individuals arrange together, should have these or those competencies, how to constrain it etc. So the main liberal position and the position of some conservative theories is that individuals exist before society and that they in some way engage in contractual relations and form a society. In contrast, anarchism and great number of leftist ideas – formulated as leftist then – have the idea that nothing exists before society. There is no individual as such, no natural individual. Now, and it is kind of Kropotkin's idea – if individuals have anything natural then it is the instinct for association. It is, essentially, a formal principle – here we can't talk about human nature. We could say 'natural human', which is not at all 'human with nature' – natural human could have an instinct for association, simply formal principle – and what will come out of it is different question. In that sense the individual, individual freedom, individual slavery, etc., doesn't exist outside the context of the society. It is the great difference between traditional anarchism and liberal and some conservative theories.

However, the thing that connects and brings these traditional theories closer together is the idea that individuals and society are formed on the basis of something outside of society. In the liberal or some conservative varieties of this idea of association, the basis of association is some outside authority,

the 'foreign' one, i.e. detached both from society and from individuals. The authority could be written contract, as the road to society, or some already established institution, like the state or whatever that makes social relations functioning. On the other hand, and similar to that, traditional anarchism too presumes one moment separated from individual and society. It is that natural instinct or in any case something which – however intelligible or not – could induce human to form a society.

The second thing that is common for all these traditional political philosophies is that they are really looking for some essence of association, some essence of collectivity. In the terms of Enlightenment it would be a kind of The Whole, the social rationality. It is just given at this moment, later on we will see how postanarchism criticize that idea.

As for the relation of individual and power, traditional anarchism – exactly because it presumes that individuals have some natural instinct for association – assumes that it is possible, which means that it was, that it still could be, and that in any case it should be – much more relations between individuals on the grounds of that natural tendency to association, which are always characterized as solidarity, sincere, direct etc. If there were no outside institutions that restrict, individuals would develop the relations of solidarity etc. In that sense power is always detached from individual and always presents invasion of some foreign force into society. I think it could be said that the traditional anarchist idea is: society against the state, of that the state is against society. It is the point of absolute contrast to liberal and conservative ideas, which see much more organic connection there. So, as for the relations of power and individual, individual could be understood as naturally free or clean – in which this natural does not mean that it has some essential characteristics.

Thus, in some moment we have arrival of power and authority into society, and individuals have to formulate some kind of response to that. What traditional anarchism supposes is that individuals, on the grounds of the way they are repressed and how the domination and power is exercised over them, could form in certain identities.

Traditional anarchism is again ambiguous. At one side we have an idea that it is political domination, political power, that determines relations of domination in contemporary society. On the other side – and I have mentioned that – there are economic relations, so called 'base relations', which came into anarchism mostly through the influence of Marx's writings. Anyway, it means that we have some kind of domination on which we should focus our attention in order to change social relations.

Organizing against power presumes that...

Sanja: Just a moment, we have a question..

Tanja Ostojić: Would it be important to you, in the whole story, the relations in primitive societies? The position of power existed there, too, although it was not due to political or economical position but – in most primitive societies, as well as in animal world – due to some physical strength or some similar kind of power. I mean, is it in the nature of human kind and animal kind to always follow the position of power? Or is it only in the case when the position of power is so institutionalized that it can't be controlled anymore?

Misha: I could answer that now, but I would like to ask you – if it's not a problem – to mention few more things in which I'm going to deal with that question of naturalness and natural source of power. If, eventually, you don't hear that, I ask you to intervene... because I wouldn't deal with it at this point. Thank you.

As for the formulation of revolt, i.e. resistance or revolutionary change, it is necessary to identify with some of these places of repression. For traditional Marxism and that part of anarchism that accepts that theory, it is necessary to identify with that place of repression which is brought as a center of economic exploitation, and that is proletariat. Proletariat is based at the place of economic exploitation, he is most repressed – because he is at the place of basic repression he also possesses the greatest ability, at least structural, to change relations and reconstruct the society on some other grounds.

On the other side we have this anarchism which insists on political relations, and which mostly withered away at the close of XIX and the beginning of XX century, when contemporary anarchism was formulated. The approaches of this anarchism could still be seen in some trials of building communes or any other autonomous areas, autonomous of all political institutions, all political exercises of power.

As for postanarchism, some of its moments could be found in Stirner. Stirner is largely overlooked from anarchist theorists and activists, liberal theorists and activists etc., he is from the start rejected as individualist. Which is mostly true... but it is not a reason to reject him. Anyway, Stirner's main question about defining individual and society is: Who speaks? For Stirner the main question is who speaks and how is the individual identity formed in the society. When it's said, in the old Enlightenment's project: 'liberation of Man', 'freedom, equality, fraternity', whatever – we have a man in the center of interest. Stirner's critique of liberal enlightenment – I don't know if Enlightenment could be understood as something other than liberal – asks if we can reduce individual to characteristics of a species, be it animal or whatever. So, the individual reduced to human is individual whose most characteristics were erased. For Stirner it is always a question who defines what is human, who defines what is individual which has to liberate herself and which is repressed.

Postanarchism, or even poststructuralism, adds to this question. And now

I'll deal with that problem of natura. For poststructuralism and for that idea that postanarchism continues there is nothing natural. So, postanarchism says: both individual and nature are the product of society. We talk about nature in the society which is, say, technologically at certain level, which has this-and-that economic relations, this-and-that relations of power, it speaks about nature inside of it's culturally determined understanding of naturalness. Something natural for us in Serbia is not natural for Chinese or Eskimos, etc. 'Natural' points only to that which is understood as natural, or on the other side that in relation to which natural is defined. When we have one technologically advanced society we are asking ourselves a lot what is natural, how to go back, how to evade the destruction that comes from such civilization etc. Natural is not posed in the societies which don't have some opposite notion to which it can be contrasted.

In that sense, traditional anarchism stands on the same position: it defines characteristics of individual and the ways of answer articulation, though that which represses us. In some way, it is trying to escape essentialism by saying 'we are defined by the society, we are free only when everyone is free' etc., but essentialism persists in that position – we are something opposed to power. We are not contaminated by power, we are always repressed, we don't take part in it – we only need to defend ourselves and crush the institutions of power. On the other hand, it is the essentialisation of that other position – that other is also natural and essential; power is natural. How can we then defend from something which is as natural as we are?

Postanarchism, thus, rejects that idea of naturalness, rejects the idea of universal identities such as 'Man'. In this it is continuing Stirner's ideas. So, there is no such identity that can fully encircle us. Also the question why there is no identity is closely related to the question of the source of power. For poststructuralism and the idea that postanarchism continues the power is not something that can be owned, which is exercised over others. Power is not something that distinguishes those who are dominated from those who dominate. Power, in poststructuralism – particularly in Foucault, although it is more or less developed in all others – so that idea which postanarchism continues, says that relations of power are not something that exists outside us. We are all, in our everyday practices, participating in relations of power. What postanarchism says about traditional anarchism is that it is wrong to understand power as mere repression, as domination. In poststructuralism power could be understood as any action that restricts functioning or actions of others. In that sense we are constantly participating in relations of power.

Trivunac: Excuse me... If I have understood well, people who are exposed to repression – participate in that repression, too? By being exposed to repression? Poststructuralist anarchism, thus, puts people who are exposed to re-

pression in the same position as those who exercise that repression?

Misha: Partially correct, first answer to...

Trivunac: Excuse me again, then it... (suddenly, his chair breaks and he falls to the ground) (laughter) Ah, these chairs of are so bad! (laughter)

Misha: Repression, repression...

Trivunac: I can't believe... Excuse me – I have literally fall from the chair when I heard this... I couldn't believe...

Misha: Spectacle, spectacle...

Trivunac: In other words, if I've understood well, a worker working in the factory, while boss is exploiting him and living off his work, also participates in that repression...? In the same way women beaten by a man is also participating in that repression, because he beats her? Have I understood well?

Misha: No, you've understood wrong. Anyway...

Sanja: Sorry for interrupting you. Questions should be more concise and shorter. (comment from the audience) Well, it's not so short.

Misha: I think it is concrete question... Anyway, it is the place to which I was going to, but this is excellent introduction to it. So, what postanarchism says is: yes, those who consider themselves repressed also participate in repression – but not in the sense in which they are repressed. Because power is exercised in various social practices there is not only one source – which is traditional anarchist understanding, there is not a source of repression, be it political power, state or so on, or concentrated economic relations, bosses exploiting workers. That said, worker is not participating in the same way in his exploitation – in some sense maybe he's not participating at all – in the way boss exploits him, but that doesn't make him clean: he participates in other relations of power, in other relations where he could repress someone other. (reaction from the audience)

Sanja: Question on question, reply to reply, in principle should not... Misha is already speaking more than it is planned...

Misha: That is correct...

Sanja: So... is there anymore questions for Misha? (reaction from the audience) No, it just leads discussion into details, and I think it's going to last long – and we have two more speakers, so we wouldn't have time. (reaction from the audience) We wouldn't have time for everyone. Simply, that's the question of organization.

Misha: We could maybe... should I answer, or to leave that question for the finish?

Sanja: Ok, one more question for Ratibor.

Trivunac: Now, I'll repeat it with a microphone. I don't get it, you have said that they both participate, and now you're saying that maybe they don't... What is it, then?

Misha: The point is that it is not possible to reduce relations to exactly determined...

Trivunac: No, I don't get it...

Sanja: Well, they participate in some way. (reaction from Trivunac) You've got your answer.

Misha: You've given an excellent example. We have a worker who is repressed in the factory, i.e. exploited; he is in that power-relation completely under domination, completely exploited. Maybe it's exactly that worker which you've mentioned that came home and beats his wife. He is not free from relations of power, he could also dominate. The fact that he is at one place repressed and under domination doesn't make him a bit cleaner, doesn't make him a bit cleaner for the revolutionary movement.

That's the point of postanarchist critique thrown at traditional anarchism: it is about concentrating the questions at the centers of power. Center of power in traditional anarchism could be either political force or economical enforcement. In that sense, postanarchism rejects that place. There is no central place of repression.

What postanarchism also criticise – and where we are, I hope, closing to the end – is in the scope of defining what should be tactical/strategic approach. Postanarchism criticise that idea of strategic political philosophy which concentrates around some center that should be changed or which is the source of all that should be changed in the society – be it economic or political domination. Postanarchism rejects understanding of society as some center of exploitation and domination, around which stretch, thus, concentrated circles,

of which – as we go farer from the center – the question becomes more and more irrelevant.

Somehow the question of women got into that traditional anarchism, and it's already standard for traditional anarchism. But there is multitude of other circles which traditional anarchism still sees as irrelevant. It is far from the center – exploitation is the most important thing; should we define ourselves in this or that way, it's different story, but we have economic relations in the base. It is strategic political understanding, it is traditional political philosophy.

On the other side, postanarchism advocates tactical political philosophy, for which all relations in the society are, let's say, lines intersecting each other; it is all relations of power, all possible social practices which cannot be reduced to one main source. There is no possibility to reduce that practices on one main source and still contain all relations against which we need to fight. In that sense, the field of social relations is a multitude of intersecting practices. Some of them could in some context be more important than others, but neither could be focused as the center of interest, otherwise we neglect any other insistence, and every other insistence on the change of power relations is seen as either reactionary or irrelevant. Postanarchism rejects that strategic political philosophy.

Because we all participate in relations of power, more or less, in this way or another, the question is not how to organize in certain structures which are going to focus and attack that center, to change society and to rebuild it on new basis, on new ethical or whatever principles, but to point in every moment, in every way, at all possible relations of domination, thus concentrated power – power which is unequally distributed, power that has institutional base, power which cannot be reduced to only individual relations and such, but the power that is socially grounded and structured, which is determined in that way. So, when we are born as certain biological beings – and that is also a question – and so get blue or rose dresses, and get educated in this or that way, and at the age of eight or nine we cannot play with the girls etc., it is all irrelevant for traditional anarchism. Traditional anarchist institutions will educate differently in one free society. For postanarchism it is very important question, because that relations of power are stretching through all social relations. These are the questions which cannot be left for later and called less important.

In that sense postanarchism rejects strategic political organizations which are trying to group all questions around one center and gather their members on the basis of identification. Postanarchism rejects parties and syndicates – parties as traditional anarchism, and syndicates as some anarchisms, because that represents identification over particular place of repression.

Postanarchism, on the other hand, assumes that those groups which are

not oriented towards particular center should be diffuse. We are in various relations of power so we have various possibilities for different organizing. Thus, postanarchism supports any group that rejects so called 'Bigger Picture', which is in fact tighter because it erases many things. The rejection of that bigger picture makes it possible to organize smaller groups, which is in traditional or not so traditional – but in any case older – anarchism called 'affinity group', which is in postanarchism concentrated not only at relations which connect individuals in the group, but on concrete questions – which solution gives reason for the end of the group existence. There is no reason to keep the group for the group's sake only, for the focusing on some other center. Group is dismantling when it achieves what it wants, or when it changes its goal. It is postanarchist principle.

The third thing that postanarchism offers as a tactic is the idea that there is no guarantee. Postanarchism says that there is no way to guarantee to someone that if he do this, that will happen. There is no way to guarantee that such-and-such way of organizing or of such-and-such revolution, or whatever, brings something other, better. There is only a possibility to articulate answer in concrete relations, to articulate alternative and work on it. Concrete goals are enough – not the only – but enough to characterise postanarchist group.

Finally, postanarchism – which is maybe most unpleasant thing for traditional anarchists – rejects idea of revolution. Revolution, as postanarchism sees it, represents a redefinition of social relations on different grounds. One normalization and normativization which is carried throughout society will be replaced with another. It would be change at the root which will challenge and change all social, economical and political relations, but will be all the same normativization, a normalization of relations. Postanarchism rejects such an idea. Its idea is not to foresee what is to be achieved and what will be, but to base ourselves at something we wish to change and which restricts us, to formulate our desires and to fight against repression.

In that sense postanarchism supports, let's call them that way – insurrectional projects. Projects that are rebellious projects, projects which are concentrated at certain questions and working on them, which don't formulate society as it will be, don't have that utopian moment, but have kind of nihilistic one: rejection of all possible forms of repression. Also, postanarchism accepts all fights against relations of power and domination. It accepts all that what traditional anarchism deems irrelevant: fight against homophobic society, LGBT communities and queer communities... (reaction from audience)

Trivunac: I am really interested to know where have you – and that is generally important in whole this problem of less important questions – you're making difference between postanarchism and anarchism by arguing, from some unknown reason to me, that traditional anarchism – which is no anar-

chism from the end of XIX and the beginning of XX century, but is still active today and represents majority of anarchist movement...

Misha: Unfortunately...

Trivunac: For you... So, allegedly there are some less important questions that it does not deal with, or sees them as less important. Well I would like to know on the account of whose practice have you concluded that, and how is it possible, for instance, that the syndicate against which you are – the anarchosyndicate – was one of a few organizations to support Gay Pride here. And as far as I know, you haven't supported that Gay Pride there. I am generally interested how is it possible to claim that anarchism doesn't accept less important questions, when the idea of anti-authority itself opposes all those less important repressions which exist. So, that worker which is a member of some traditional anarchist organization... (Sanja's intervention)

Trivunac: No, no – it is very important...

Sanja: This is not a quarrel between Misha and Ratibor, so let's continue – shorten your question and that is that.

Trivunac: Don't you ever take microphone from my hands again! By force! I mean, let's make it clear... So don't you ever take microphone from my hands by force! You've taken it by force...

Misha: Otherwise – what? Let's show anarchism at work: what will happen if she take microphone from your hands?

Trivunac: Well I will take it then from her hands...

Misha: ...which is already in your hands...

Trivunac: What does it mean to take away microphone at an anarchist discussion?! No, no, please – let me finish. I mean, don't behave in so authoritarian way at some allegedly anarchist discussions. It is very important question, I cannot shorten it because it is very important and goes to the point, to the essence of speech of mister... (Sanja's intervention) Ok, here, let me finish... Ok, so I am interested, and it gets to the essence what was Milić talking about. So, posed is... (reaction from audience) The thesis is posed that traditional anarchism, in contrast to some allegedly postanarchism, is blind to those less – under quotations 'less' – important questions. I am interested how is it possible to claim something like that if it is known that the idea of traditional an-

archism is a struggle against authority at all levels. So that worker that beats his wife is certainly not a member of traditional anarchist group. The worker who is against someone, against homosexuals, is certainly not a member of traditional anarchist group, and so I am interested – where did you get that idea and on what do you ground your claims?

Sanja: Just a thing... I didn't take a microphone by force, the question should be short and Ratibor you haven't applied as a speaker. (Trivunac's reaction) Ok, but I mean, mister attending-the-discussion, you haven't applied as a speaker. Misha, do you want to answer the question?

Misha: Well yes, there are two questions. First, the more interesting one: anarchosyndicate have supported, and very interesting fact is that you were the member of that anarchosyndicate... That 'we' in anarchosyndicate is very small number of people, and it could be said since we are already throwing out names... So, a certain number of people, which is very small number – you can count them on the half of fingers on one hand – have supported Gay Pride. That what is presented as my non-support of Gay Pride is my choice to go to the dentist. That, of course, is not a support, just as standing there is not a support – and then when someone asks you how to solve problems of women and homophobia in the society everything gets down to economic relations – and that the thing that gave birth must be first to destroy, in order to change all other relations.

The only difference that I accentuate is not that traditional anarchism rejects some questions, or that it understands them as irrelevant in a sense that they should not be touched at all – but it understands them as something that will be solved in the way that is different from the repressed's understanding of their own position... (reaction from Trivunac)

Misha: On the basis of what I've read, seen and did, and heard from others. Also, it is not true that...

Sanja: Sorry, Misha, just a second. Could we... because here we also have guests from Zagreb, who also have to talk... can we stop following this argument into details, and just continue? Do you agree? Ok. Misha, do you have something to add?

Misha: I have finished with everything, just to answer this last question in which I am called to give accounts of sources. Anarchism, above all else in the works of Bakunin – who is maybe someone in anarchism – is not against every authority. It could be found in various Bakunin's works. So, the thing you've said is either not traditional anarchism, or is not anarchism, or you're

trying to construct the situation in which we need to refer to some sources. And that's it, thank you.

Sanja: Ok, is there any more questions? For now?

Vladimir Marković: I am Vladimir Marković. I would like to ask the speaker Milić, because he has mentioned concrete tactics of postanarchism, to... because he spoke pretty much theoretically, to put it at empirical level and explain to us if he has some affinity group – traditionally-anarchistic speaking – what does it do, what is it called, what are it's goals, how it achieves them, etc. Thank you.

Misha: Thank you for your question, but I will say nothing about that. (reaction from audience)

Sanja: It is not about that, these questions are complex and we can't answer during this discussion – I guess it's obvious – to all that questions in detail. So – have some understanding. Let's go on. (reaction from audience)

Misha: It is concrete thing, I agree – but I will take a right to present this what I spoke about as only, if anything, inspiration for others, and not as promotion of any group doing any thing. Thank you. (reaction from audience)

Sanja: Well, it's the answer. (reaction from audience)

Misha: Exactly – think about that ideas.

Sanja: There are different ways to interpret it, so you sit and think... So, let's continue... (reaction from audience) No, I am just trying to make it continue. Is it possible? Is it? Now, beside Miloš Milić who spoke briefly – as it could be in the context of a discussion, conversation – we have here guests from Zagreb, Marko and Dražen, who will tell us – in contrast to Misha who have theoretically abstracted some ideas in contemporary anarchism – what are they doing, thus more from personal experience at these region. Who will speak first? Dražen will go first, there you go.

Dražen Šimleša: Greetings to everyone. I feel sorry now because I'm not good in telling jokes, it would be good introduction, for relaxation. For the beginning I will say that very briefly after I've finished my first book which some – let's say with some dose of praise, some with a bit of joking – are calling the first book on anarchism after the dismantling of Yugoslavia... that very soon I have realized that I've made a mistake, because particularly in the Croatian

media and then in a part of a crew, the scene, they've started to call me the greatest theoretician of anarchism, or something similar, in fact – which I don't think is only a coincidence – in the very book of theoretical discussions about anarchism most of today's theoreticians of anarchism are men. It's all so full of ego and soon you realize that they, after some years of developing their ideas, start arguing against each other, and not dealing with what they think is important and what could make this world more free and better, which I think is an essence of anarchism.

It is a matter of circumstances that this book helped me in that – well, it's a book *Snaga utopije* (The Power of Utopia) which, it should be said, developed from my final thesis at Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, and it happened that people are not at all interested in arguments about who is greater anarchist – Bob Black or Chomsky, or whoever – in fact that it's too boring, but that they're interested in what anarchism could give to this world, i.e. what are the anarchist methods and tactics that could develop solidarity and liberty of each of us, and autonomy, and so on. So I am less interested in arguing about some future society which would be based on solidarity, but it's more important to me today to do some actions that are based on that and in that sense I find it less fun to talk about anarchism and indeed more fun to work some anarchist things, in whichever direction they lead.

After that book, in my understanding of anarchism I was pretty much moved forward by the fact that in the second half of 80's and all the way to the last few years a lot of things changed in Zagreb, as some war themes faded away. Lot of things happened, lot of actions, new people; in that sense most of us was, in fact, interested in that practice. How can we put into practice those things that we care about. Very special role in all that was played by really successful action with which my dissatisfaction with practical part of anarchism went to the top – demonstrations against the war in Iraq, which were successful both in Croatia and in Zagreb, although the war hasn't been stopped, and that – let's call it that way – the global peace- or alterglobalist movement hasn't stopped the war. It was really important to keep Croatia away from that war, and to push our government not to get in it in our names, and we have 100% succeeded in that.

I found it very problematic that – although we had great actions, from the breaking of Parliament sessions to big actions at main square – although anarchist participated in the actions too, we were so dependent on that system that we were demonstrating against. So, when I speak about the system I don't mean system at abstract level, but exactly the system which starts wars for resources on which we are all dependent as individuals, as anarchists, groups of people; we were still enjoying all the benefits and were in a great degree a part of a system against which we rebelled. And then several of us tried to find out how to change that famous phrase, or notorious cry at that anti-war demon-

strations: 'no to war for oil' – in which we explicate our anti-war stance – to a more affirmative cry: 'no to oil for war'. Thus, how to tell this system that we don't need it, that we can all by ourselves build some system which would be based on solidarity, sharing, autonomy, and some better relations.

And so I went with several other people from Zagreb, trying to establish beside Zagreb some kind of eco-social educational center, which we don't call a commune because it is opened to all people, and that became our practical area for researching and also for things dealing with energy, food and masonry, which are all aspects of the society we are so dependent on, where we are in fact just consumers. We tried to change the story, to become producers in as many instances as we can. It is in my opinion a lot harder thing than organizing an action or demonstration, because it asks for everyday activity and constantly getting back to it, but then – although we don't stress that we are anarchists or that it is an anarchist project, because it's not so important – it was successful because of the energy between us, and without that better relations between us, between the people who started this story – we wouldn't make anything, it would all stay in the talks.

I would not bore you with what we are producing, we can leave it maybe for the discussion, but I've mentioned some things – energy, masonry, i.e. buildings, food, in which we developed something and tried to be autonomous from the system we don't like, and tried to build some kind of knowledge and skills collection which we could offer to others as a present, so that they could put it into practice, because we experienced that many people don't know how to make something. So, we had that situation, at least in Croatia, that people ask less about the need to do something – they have more problem with the lack of knowledge and informations on how to build something, and of money. So, everything we did needed to be either very cheap or free. From that reasons, when we have learned some things we started printing free brochures and giving them to people. Today you have one of them here, about the energy, and you can take it; we also didn't want that these people who needed something from us depend on financial power. I don't know about you here – it's probably the same, but in Croatia everything which is eco-, natural-, bio-, be it energy, cosmetics or gymnastics is extremely 'high' and expensive. Ok, so, in Croatia everything you can get at the market is extremely expensive. Yes, just like in the West – we've got it from there.

The social aspect of the story was very important to us because with that place, with that land, we manage together; so we are all owners of two thirds of that land, that educational center – one third is private and it's usually private houses, but everything other is common property and we manage it together, as some kind of cooperative. Our parents were very pleased when they realised that the land they've given us, and some that we privately bought, was given to all. Even today they see us as, like, their children, but a bit derranged

because we've decided that way, but – as the story develops, as more people come to us and as we spread among, let's say, common people that knowledge and skills we've learned, and it's very important to us – so the level of their misunderstanding and critics is lesser.

So that's a kind of story that I've got into by reading anarchism, doing actions, listening to it, trying to ask myself what am I doing there, what do I want. But I don't think that it is the only thing that people need to do, because we're cooperating with groups...

Sanja: Sorry, Dražen, just one question.

Tanja Ostojic: I find your project very interesting. I would be interested to know the size of that area, the land, and what you really produce and in which degree are you self-sufficient when it comes to energy and food.

Sanja: Just one thing: whoever has a comment just raise your hand, because we're recording this.

Dražen: The project is not finished yet, we're still working on all those things you're interested about. As for the energy, which was our main concern, be it electricity or transport, we reached 100% autonomy, we are geared for electricity with little windmill and solar modules. As protection we also have big accumulator working on bio-diesel, which we're producing by recycling waste from vegetable oil. Also a van of our organization, some kind of private transportation, is functioning in that way.

As for the food, since we're still not 100% there so far we are satisfying our basic needs. We have reduced gardening this year because our priority is to finish residential houses, in order to live there as food production demands. I don't know...

Ah, the area... Well it's still not so important to us, because more and more people want to join, we have more friends who would like to come close to us or beside us. So far our area is little more than 1ha, but even that is too much for us – it's pretty large area. If we lived there and devoted more energy to it we could have spread more because, as in most of such places, the region is more or less unpopulated. What is also important for me to tell you is that we don't think that our way is the way to be followed, we don't think that people should leave cities or something like that; we are glad that the area is close to the city. Most of that knowledge and skills that we're teaching could be done in cities and should be done in cities because cities – if we speak about ecological, even social problems – are suffering much more than some rural areas. So we work very much in the cities, we do workshops in cities and that kind of connection is really important to us. That's why we say that the place is far

enough and close enough. Thus, there's a kind of communication.

Well, I would finish with this question. I would like it more if we could discuss and argue then to bore you with something that you're maybe not interested in, so, here, I'm passing a word to Marko.

Marko Strpić: Thank you for passed word... Good evening, my name is Marko. I publish books about all that. In fact it's about publishing house Što čitaš? And, in contrast to all these stories, I'm not so much in either of them. I'm in neither of those fractions, versions – and I'm telling this as an editor of publishing house – and the point is that the publishing politics of Što čitaš? from the very beginning is to put together all that currents, some undercurrents of anarchism, of the ways we see things because – as far as I'm concerned – we're going in a kind of similar or the same direction. And about the question how are we going to make it, how will we live in the future, well it's like... the matter of the future.

The whole project started some six or seven years ago, as a project of Zagreb's anarchist movement, with Dražen's book which was some kind of a base for everything that followed, without any idea about doing real publishing. After all the idea came that we should work more on all themes, because critics pointed at Dražen were in a way pointed to all of us who were participating in preparation of next titles, because a lot of people – around ten of them – were participating in the whole story so far. And we've understood that it's about relations of anarchism or anarchisms, however we look at it, that it's important how it deals with particular questions, be it ecological questions, economical, be it question of sexuality, organization or feminism, those gender issues... Now there is an idea to do a whole serial of those books. One of the first books published in that serial was Anarchism and violence, where the question of violence was problematized exactly in the moment when all that happened in Genoa, but also all those demonstrations before that, when the violence became very visible and connected to anarchism in all media.

Although this whole story was about anarchism, and it still is, the need arised for some different literature. And because the idea was always about publishing something we need, something we're going to read, something that people want to read, something that will give them practical knowledge – which follows what Dražen already said – we made books like Permaculture, which is some kind of introduction i very practical guide for permacultural projects, the way to start them, to do things, either in rural or urban areas, why is it important for society, in what way. And in fact I find that titles much more useful then some big theoretical arguments about which way to go, how to change society – if we can't change our community or achieve something constructive at this discussion... then we can't think about changing the world.

The other part that is covered inside this whole story is in fact that attitude towards media, because the media are pretty much defining our relations to things, our attitudes. On the other hand also the attitude towards that anarchism – which in fact became more or less public thing – and there we've published several books that deal precisely with that. So, could journalists be activists, what could be the attitude of activists towards media, how do medias manipulate, are they manipulating, can we or can we not use media.. And I would particularly like to mention this book *People from the television*, written by Martina Glubočnik, who is journalist, activist, who in fact dealt with the question of activism in the media and gave some kind of guide to everyone who does something publicly, who want to send a message, and it's the easiest and simplest to do through the media. Of course, we can think whatever we want about that, is it good or bad, but it's some kind of practical guide for everyone who is interested in that kind of activity.

What is of more importance to me with *Što čitaš?* – beside this printed material that has limited reach although it is accessible in most bookstores – is some trial to reach more people, do reach the people that are not in the circle of friends, supporters, people who are already in it, somehow already interested in it. Few years ago the whole project went on-line, so so aside from the possibility to buy this books in physical form – and they have to be bought simply because the printing has it's price – they are accessible also on the Internet, they can be downloaded from the web page along with some 200-300 various texts, smaller or larger books... and I think it's pretty good because they could be reproduced and you can do whatever you want with them, although some of them are not intended for after-use, but it's a matter of each of us what are we going to do with them.

I wouldn't like to talk more about publishing house, because I don't know the direction... I would rather answer some questions... is there no questions?

Audience: Marko, I would like to ask you just one thing: what do you think about the slip that the host made in the introduction when he introduced the publishing house as *Što činiš?* (What do you do?) instead of *Što čitaš?* (What do you read?)? Is it by coincidence?

Marko: (laughter) Yes, I believe it is... but the other version is also a good name. (laughter)

Sanja: Is there any more questions? Because now we'll have a discussion you can ask anyone who talked today, whatever you're interested about, so... come on, ask... (laughter)

Ksenija Forca: I would like to ask what kind of workshops are you giving in cities? Ksenija Forca from QueerBelgrade.

Dražen: In cities we are giving all the workshops we give on our land too, from the food production in cities on the roofs, or on the side, some kind of urban stories of food production, solar collectors for warm water which we already attached to some balconies in Zagreb for the people who don't have warm water, bio-diesel – the thing we use for our automobiles. Concretely we are doing – we haven't done that in Zagreb because we didn't have such partners – for example in the Pula's barracks of Karlo Rojc, for which some of you might have heard because it was a good experiment where the non-government sector, the civil society, got for the use one obsolete military facility – so on the balcony of that barracks we've attached one windmill for the use of ecological association, we gave them that as a present for the education of it's members and children for Pula's schools, faculties and so on. Thus, I can't imagine any workshop that we're doing at our land in rural area that we didn't do in Zagreb. It is clear that in the city there is a problem of a space because there are different conditions, but it is not an obstacle for anyone to say – about the wide scope of useful skills and knowledge – „Sorry, I don't have a room to cultivate those carrots, you do that and I will buy them if they're good, but teach me this, I need it in my life“. I don't think that everyone need to do everything and thus our land doesn't strive to achive some kind of absolute self-sufficiency, where we don't need anyone from this world, but for us it's more important to know and produce something, to share that with those who need it – they give us something other... So, everyone can choose the thing that is useful not only from the things we do, but also that others do. I think it's important to share things, knowledge and skills that we have because it is in my oppinion, from my experience, the greatest problem. People want to learn things, they want to change their life, but don't know how, with what, and the biggest problem: they think it costs a lot.

Sanja: Ok, we have one more question.

Sonja Drljević: My name is Sonja Drljević. I would like to know if you can live from what you do and, I mean, what you earn?

Dražen: Well, there are some people who – as for the economical construction of this whole story – who have either some suitable jobs to live at such place or have some occasional jobs which make it possible to live at that land, but it's already clear that some of us are going to live off that soil. So far we haven't charged anything for a single workshop, so all things which we do for people were covered in some other way. The users themselves, it was kind of

a rule, the users of the workshops must have had them for free, to spread it more easily and painfully – so we don't think so much about charging for our knowledge, although personally I don't have problem with that because people need to live from what they do, but we are more oriented towards production. Thus, that a land itself becomes some kind of productional center for – I don't know if it is going to be food, or... For example, some people from our organization already have an order for building two houses to some third party, and they will do it for money.

Sonja Drljević: I am interested if you're still doing something else and live from that, pay your rent and everything else, or if you can practically satisfy all your needs from the things you do there. So – you know what I mean – and if you have children nad send them to school and all that, or is it just the beginning?

Dražen: Yes, it's just a beginning, because the land is still in construction and we don't live from it anyway.

Vanda Perović: I am Vanda Perović and I'm interested to know if your community is of mixed character, do women participate and what is the division of work in your community, if something like that exists?

Dražen: Women are participating too. Division of work is very often forced by itself, and that is something that we are very unsatisfied with. I wouldn't even say that it is forced in the context of the hardship of physical work, which is something someone could think of, but I don't know answer to that question but, for example, quite a few girls are interested in energy thing, in the sense that they're really doing it, not only hearing about it, but also learning about it. So, when we're all covered with oil and producing fuel, od when we go to install a windmill somewhere, there are far less girls then boys on that expedition. But, then, for example, when there is need for some working, digging, some hard physical work, I have to say that girls are far less theoretizing in a hard manner like „hey, you know that when he said to...“ and then more talking then working – we don't have any division of work and practically the last hard physical thing that we did was a green roof on one house, which is built from aesthetical reasons but also because it is very nice isolation so less energy is wasted whatever you use for heating in the house... most of that work has been done – if we already divide people in that way – by persons of female sex.

Nenad Romić: Good evening, Nenad Romić, from Zagreb. A comment and then a question.

At the beginning Misha mentioned, in fact, that anarchism deals above all else with attack on the centers of power, and then in some traditional variant – according to his definition – we should strike at place of economic power, i.e. there where greatest exploitation exists, and as we have a label of proletariat and work with proletariat. On the other hand there are other places of repressed, endangered, so when I look from that perspective at what you're talking I have a feeling that it's some kind of escapism, like you've made some... simply cooled-out... is it because it's better in Croatia – so you it's done that way? What kind of potential you see now in working with proletariat, with the workers; what kind of potential you see in working with other groups for which you could say that are repressed? And is it, in fact, the thing you present here actually reaction to another place of power, and that is a power to interpret what is freedom and what is anarchism – and then especially at these places, in this way, you're trying to tell what kind of power position are they taking in the interpretation of all those important things? Thank you.

Sanja: Who will answer the question?

Dražen: Did you ask us or Miloš? Well, then, the microphone is in my hands, so...

Sanja: He talked about Croatia, so I think the question is pointed at you.

Romić: Yes, yes, because you've told us what you're doing. And it is not a question for Misha, although I'd like to hear his answer because it's about what you've said here today. And, on other side, to tell this story about the potential of working with repressed groups in Croatia, what is the situation in Croatia – because I think it's important particularly if it can be compared to situation in Serbia.

Dražen: Well, I would say that we don't see our project as escapist, if we can say that we are 'electricity' escapists because we don't depend on the system at that point and we like it, I think it's positive and that more people should think about such things because, as I previously said, it is important question to us to try and send to the system against we're principally against a message that we don't need it for satisfying some of our basic needs, that we are able to make it ourselves. Of course we didn't make it 100% so far, but from our beginning five years ago when we didn't even know how to measure neither a house, neither a base of it, so we've made them wrong – today we could say that we've managed something, and I say: with lots of mistakes and new learnings and downs. So, I think the people shouldn't be afraid of that, they should stick to dogmas less and experiment a lot more, to work even if they

make a mistake – they will learn a lot from it.

As for the cooperation with other people, our land is really opened and as we work more we've noticed that more people are coming, more different people. One of our next great projects, which we're working on and which is agreed upon, is teaching local peasants in our district to produce food for themselves, to make a bio-diesel themselves. So it is also important because they are a group that gravitates a lot around us because it is rural region. It's something we're going to teach them how to be less vulnerable to everything that is happening with the oil. You see, it is important to us because we don't only speak about the war in Iraq, about oil etc., but I also think that we're all aware that resources that move this world are important for everything, so they're important for the price of the food, because whole food production depends on that; they are important for the cost of electricity in our homes, for the prices of cosmetics. So the whole thing is a lot wider and transcends some, let's say, ecological frames, in which we could be some kind of interesting hippies who made their farm and now we're, I don't know, cultivating our food and undress when the rain comes.

So as we have more self-confidence, as we learn more – for these things there should pass a period during which you learn some things, experiment and bring them to a phase in which you're sure enough that you can give it to someone else. So it's not like – I write a book and give it to public, and after two years I say «I don't agree with it anymore» – I've written it then, ok; you can't offer someone something that won't work. Well, I've said it, now we're going to teach our local peasants things that are important to them, and it is a cooperation with a people with whom we wouldn't have a contact otherwise... like, we're living different lives, we have different ideologies and don't communicate.

Marko: I will just briefly comment on this question of proletariats, especially in Croatia, about the thing workers do there. Occasionally there are some sparks and impulses, like in Valpova which is an agricultural firm that workers took over, managed almost two years through syndical account and eventually ran some kind of privatization similar to that in Argentina in some way, but actually the workers themselves became owners of the firm. The same thing is what are workers of Tobacco industry Zagreb trying to do now, although it's a different story, with its specific moments. I think that those are only sparks, moments when people in desperate situation, brought to the edge or the end, when their existence is in the question, that they react to some things but I don't think that there is some systematic organizing around that question, some clear consciousness about the way that production – especially when we speak about industrial facilities, if we speak about proletariat in that way – could be organized or changed. But, on the other hand, I don't know if I'm

competent to talk about all that because I'm not dealing with it directly although I am informed about it. Ok, I could be in a communication with those people and everything, but... In fact I don't see myself as someone who will go there and say: good, I'll now give you a recipe – because I don't have it.

Misha: So, just to make a comment and to ask a question since it's my turn. I wouldn't use a word 'escapism', but anyway, I'll go to question in which it would be clearer what I want to comment on.

The community you've formed – in what sense is that what you're giving to others as some skill, that you can share with others, in what sense do you have an approach «we're doing it because this-and-that doesn't suit us, and we want such-an-such relations to change in the society, and so we're offering you these skills», and in what sense – and this is only a question, I don't presume anything – in what sense it could be understood that you're just doing something that some state or non-government organization would do, and so it is cheaper for the state that you teach people? So in what sense is there a moment that you explicitly say why you're doing something, and in what sense – since you said you don't call yourselves... that in that contact you don't use so much the label of 'anarchists' etc. – in what sense the things that you do is presented as alternative, and in what sense just a help for living?

Dražen: Well, now, my idea when I said that we don't introduce ourselves like: «we are anarchists and we'll come to save your lives because our ideology is most righteous in the world and has a solution for you» - so we're bringing it down to lower level, although the people who know us and get deeper into our world know pretty well what is our background. We are always explicitly stating it, but our message is not... So for me the way we're doing it is important, but I don't care what Bakunin or Chomsky thinks about it, instead of teaching people something concrete and practical, to give them introduction of an hour why are we there. It goes really fast.

Most of those things state doesn't do, and will never do, i.e. it doesn't do it in that way. And since we're already at that question, in lot of western countries of Europe, and soon it will be the same in Croatia, it's the point where we're losing – let's say a kind of time advantage – you can buy bio-diesel at gas-stations, which is made at large monocultural fields with pesticides, in the same way that industrial food is produced and we certainly don't induce people to do the same, and we tell them very clearly that they don't do anything useful – neither for the planet, neither for the peace in the world, because the whole system is one large business, ecological business, with nice label... and it's also something we are aware of.

And, personally, is it true that states don't teach people to produce food, or to make their own solar collectors for warm water because it is cheap and

saves money – some states are doing that. I think it's ok. Personally I don't have a problem with it, and if someone thinks it is non-anarchist to support that – well, I don't give a h*ck about it because I think it's useful thing. For example, I would like to see in Croatia a programme for 100 000 solar collectors at ugly, empty balconies in Zagreb; and I don't mean that I'll say that the Croatian state is super, or that if Croatian state does bad things I wouldn't criticize it. But I don't have a problem with the existence of projects that are making life better for people and I think they're ok.

It's that non-anarchist part of me.

Igor: Hi, I am Igor. I would like to ask a concrete question about that eco-farm, or how should I call it. As I understand it, you use timber a lot, as a source of energy, for buildings etc., and if we spread it now to some mass usage, how much is that kind of timber usage sustainable? Thanks.

Dražen: Well, we still haven't started the brutal usage of the timber. We are using local wood in the sustainable way that doesn't endanger eco-system in any way. In that sense we want to give an example that people could use natural materials without destroying eco-systems, which happens – although the wood and the water and lot of other things are restorable – we can destroy them in a long turn. We will use timber mostly for heating, but also by – it is something we still don't know how to do but this summer other people will do it for us – so with ultra-efficient stove that you need to heat up just once a day, where practically the consumption of the timber is negligible. And we don't use it for anything else except for one part of building construction and it's usually supporting pillar, which is not much.

With that said I also state that anyone who does something like that should know that, and when he consumes in that way, to give back some. So what we consume we should give back either by planting, or by supporting some project that does that. We are aware that the resources which are by definition restorable cannot be used unsustainably.

Sanja: This remote microphone is not working anymore, so whoever has a question must now come here.

Milica: Ok, one more question for Dražen. I am interested, that independence from the state and the system, how are you going to fight the taxes. Milica.

Miloš Rančić: Just a moment, it seems that this microphone is still working, so you don't have to get down here.

Milica: Good. Well, tax on the land, on the property, whatever they call it.

Because the Croatia is close to European Union, you are on the way to get in, and as I heard – nw, I'm not sure if that informations are correct – the taxes on the property are pretty expensive there, and so those small farm are closing because they are unsustainable. They can't cover expenses. So, how would you fight that?

Dražen: Well, so far we haven't got problems with taxes, the taxes on real estate that we have are really low. I think that farms in Croatia are not ruined by taxes, but because the whole system is organized so that small farmers cannot cope with big competition, a that is also on us, the consumers – who live in the city – that we don't support those people because it's more easy for us to go to some shopping mall, and we all find it disgusting... not just the people who produce food, but anyone who is small in this system – that he is going down, and we as anarchists are so angry, but those people are around us, they need our help at this moment, and as there are cooperatives on the countryside that produce food, so it is possible that there could be cooperatives in the city that buy food from that small people, and people are doing that in the world.

We've payed... For one house we don't have licence at all, but we're not bothering with our institutions that have a say in the matter, because we simply didn't have, honestly – it's not that we did it from some real political reasons – but we didn't have money, which is political reason for many but because the project is public and because it gathers many different people everything that could endanger it at some level, someone could by definition conclude that we're not sticking to anarchist principles and stances. So we didn't pay anything for one large part, due to our laziness to go to that office, or because we didn't have money. We payed that certain part because we couldn't have got to the house we've bought... Concretely, last year we bought a house that bothered us a lot because it was at the center of the land, we wanted it for any price – because the existence of our project was in danger, and because the visitors and us were frustrated that we have a hole in the center of the land. Eventually we've bought it and solve it in the traditional anarchist way: by giving those people money to leave, and we payed very low tax on that because it wasn't possible to buy it in some other way. And that doesn't bother us, too.

Romić: Now I will repeat one part of my question, and it's a part in which I asked you if this fact that you're not refering to some classic anarchist articulation, if it is connected to your reaction to one new place of power, and it's a place of moralizing, position that you get if someone gives you legitimation that you're an anarchist. On the other hand, when you talked that you're not introducing yourselves as anarchists, your description seemed to as if you are some religious sect that does good things, and then hides it's deep motivation

about it all. And then you said that you don't want to go there telling them: «I am an anarchist, I have an ideology that has the answer to all and it's a solution to problems of all people» - well is there really such kind of anarchists that you have to say that?

Dražen: So, when I talked about this you have to be aware that it is not my project, that I am not a boss and that all people are not thinking like me, and also it's not a project with all anarchists involved – which is not, I repeat, the most important thing in the world – so I didn't say that when I go somewhere I say «I am not that», but that when we work as organization which gives something to others it is not something that is first on our minds when we're cooperating with someone. We had super cooperation with some elementary schools – where we also taught some people – if we have stuck to it I could say that I don't want to go there because I'm an anarchist and the schools are part of the system and they are dumbing the children, so I won't do anything in that school, but it didn't happen.

Radovan: My name is Radovan, I'd like to ask what are the possibilities for coming to you on training, and how much time does it take to do a training for preparing bio-diesel, windmill or some of such basic things?

Dražen: It all depends. Thus, we don't have like two weeks to survive World War Three. Our space is still not finished – it's under construction, for some things you need more time, for others less. Bio-diesel, which is maybe the most important thing, is finished in only few hours. It's the workshop that lasts an hour or two. So something could be done in one day, when you see the whole result, you can use it instantly, and for some workshops – like when we build house with baled straw – we need at least four to five days to finish it completely and it's something that is going on more like some kind of work-camp then like workshop.

And anyone who wants to learn something can come, we are completely opened for it. We do public workshops, so not only at our farm, but we go wherever people want to learn something.

Miloš: My name is Miloš. Well, I'm not sure that we've heard an answer to previous question – how to draw a line between things that you do and something that the states could do, ie. to understand it as some kind of constructive alternative which could enmass inteself and as such become a serious alternative, or is it just a helping the state in the sense that you're doing a work that's simply not in it's interest, so you're teaching people, etc. So, that difference between something that is alternative and something that's only some kind of NGO ecological story.

I am interested – and it's my concrete question – if we assume that it becomes massive in some way, the things that you do: production of bio-diesel, healthy agricultural products, solar energy, etc., these are all things that corporations do or will do, so the big capital in essence, to enmass and that something you do become serious threat to interests of that corporations and that big capital, I'm affraid – in fact I'm certain – that the state, as the institution whose interests are inseparable from the interests of big capital, would intervene and very easily in one afternoon wipe out any such attempt. So, I'm not sure that this could be some serious alternative. So, simply, if you could give additional explanation... Where is the border between a serious alternative and some kind of helping the state, ecological etc. story?

Dražen: As I said, if you read this booklet you'll understand why we are doing that, what are our motives, our intentions and goals to spread such things... So, I don't believe that the system would... The thing that I may haven't said in a proper way is that when we give something to people we also tell them in what way is that something – if we're somewhere just for one day and have no time to give them everything we know – so, we're telling them how it is connected to other very important things and aspects: from demonstrations, and some other things that maybe at that moment we're not questioning or don't accentuate because we're dealing with other things. So we're not separating that things from the encircled system. If at certain moment we deal only with concrete workshop it's simply because sometime we don't have enough time for it, but I think that all those things are connected and I don't believe that the system is going to promote them in such way, because it would be a different system... As I see it, this system is based on big accumulation of profit, and in this story people wouldn't extract profit for someone at the top, but it would circulate among them, as is this whole principle.

And about corporations producing solar panels, or producing bio-diesel, I think that corporations also organize concerts and discussions, corporations produce food, computer programmes, but there are people who're doing it differently and who are super and need our help. So I think there's not a single thing in this world that this system is not doing or haven't find a way to make money from it. As I see it it, more important is the way in which you're giving or sharing something, then the theme itself.

Sanja: Battery in this remote microphone is definitely out, so whoever wants to comment or ask a question now must come down here, definitely. (someone from the audience is posing a question/commenting without a microphone, this is just a part of what he said in the microphone given to him)

Audience: ...It's about one thing: it's not that all of us should know how to

make everything. You learned how to build a house – why did you need that? Only for personal satisfaction. A man has to do his job and live decently from it, and he cannot if the unjust social relations, ie. exploitation, are not destroyed.

Young mister has spend a lot of time trying to discourage us and to show us that it's only esoteria, that in fact it doesn't matter, that it doesn't even exist, there are no main points to strike at, in fact all points are equally important... (reaction from one of moderators)

...Sorry, is it that I can only ask a question, a man can't say anything?
...Well I've said it, thank you.

Sanja: Someone wanted a word before you. You can make comments, I asked you if you have yuestions.

Ksenija Forca: I wanted to ask you about your attitude towards Internet as a technology, do you use computers, and how do you plan to... some tings that I find good in this system... do you plan to reject it all in some way or are you connecting them – since I understand that you're taking good things. (some reactions from the audience during Ksenija's question)

Sanja: Just a comment, I am not a moderator, so I don't know who are you point your comment at.

Dražen: We are using Internet, we're using computers, so it's 100% certain that we are going to use them on our land too. As I said, there are people that are doing some valuable things in that area in – let's say – libertarian way, in a way that it's accessible for people as much as it could be. We know how computers are produced. What I always find more important in any critic is that there are alternatives, so in this moment there is one very interesting group of people in this world, it gives us super alternatives for work on the computer, work that is not dictated or controlled by corporations and we use that; we can learn a lot from those people, they could learn something other from us that they find important.

This year there was, in my oppinion, one interesting festival in Zagreb . Freedom to creation, which was organized by a group of people that is closer to whole that story about free software, in that areas. We worked on that festival this year together with them and we were giving free organic seed for this year's sow; we taught people making bio-diesel. So, we did things about creativity and creations, shared in a free way, and has a lot to do with this theme that we're closer to. So this cooperation is very important to us and I don't think that the only important thing is this that we are dealing with, and I would never say that.

Sonja Drljević: (getting a microphone she answers to some previous comments) No, I don't have a question, but just like... Why? No, it's not like that. I mean, you shouldn't talk like that. I would like to give just one comment. As I understand it, you're actually trying – and you've succeeded in it – to show that something is done for the satisfaction of human needs, and in ways that are both ecological and – let's say – ideological. I think it's really useful and good.

And about a comment from colleague that his daddy has a garden and so... it's good, too, but his daddy has it just like my grandfather had it – he worked there to sell it somewhere etc. And about this that we have to fight against unjust conditions and to unite – it's important too, but it doesn't rule out this approach. So I just can't understand why are those things in opposition? I mean, it's not an opposition for me.

Everything has it's purpose. We need to organize both syndically and in other way, against the invading capitalism – but there should exist something that can show people that the production doesn't need to be for the profit only and that it's not important to make profit and who doesn't earn a lot is nobody. I think that such examples show that there is some other way in life, and I like it from that side.

Veljko: My name is Veljko and I have two questions, if it's not a problem. The first question is for the first speaker, about that excellent idea of local affinity groups etc. – what does he think about local group that would deal with fighting against smoking in closed rooms, in our eco-social group? That is, to paraphrase, about individual and power – is the law that prohibits smoking in closed rooms just another political lever, or should we fight against it, as a lever?

And the second question is for our guests: did they have contacts with people that surround them, like peasants themselves.... because you've talked about that you wanted to have some kind of cooperation or to make with local... You will have? Do you have some comment – how do those people, who may have some antagonism towards anarchism or other libertarian ideas – did you have such contacts? Thank you.

Misha: Now, I can't say that I am 100% sure that I've understood the direction of the question but, there, I will again stick to – because it was written like in that leaflet that somehow attacked last discussion, ie. that we here present the idea of anarchist practice as eating cookies and drinking – so I am going to continue in that sense and to theoretize again, so I'll say that if Stirner said – well, yes, «he said...», but why not – that 'freed man', the man that the others liberated, looks like a dog that still drags it's chain, I would in the somewhat same way answer that what we are given as liberation, or as

a struggle for our rights on the side of other groups, other organizations... simply if it's something that makes our living conditions better we don't have a reason to revolt, if it's worsening them then we know what to do, but in that sense the most important thing is that which we ourselves can achieve. If some right is given to us – it is still not about our strengthening, it's not a thing that we ourselves won. I don't know if that is an answer to question. This is from the standpoint of postanarchism, which in this case is not different from so called traditional anarchism.

Dražen: Yes... about this antagonism of people towards us... So, at the start we had some suspicious glances from one part of people in local community: «why did you came here to get high, from all those places around Zagreb?». Interest thing is that those people are around the age of our parent, so they came to that place only ten or twenty years before us. It is interesting that we had a lot better in fact even too optimistic support from older local people, because they romanticised the whole story as if we are going to finish everything in half a year and relive that local community, because there are fewer and fewer young people. But as we worked there more and more and as we left the trace of our own, in that direction goes that we finally... for example, without local community we couldn't have made it, that has to be clear, because they gave us water, even food and electricity, while we didn't have it, they gave us some advices... So we got there as complete strangers.

And the other important thing you should know is that we didn't choose that place. It was the only place, after several failed attempts at squatting in Zagreb, that we could work at for free at that moment, and that was property of one of us – his parents who said: «ok, fool around, let's see what you're up for this time» - because we didn't have money to buy something that could be best for us. So we went there because it was the only place that we could work at, and as we worked more and more we started to love it, and it was stupid to move away when we put some much energy and effort there.

And I would just like to add few words, if you please, to this last comments. I think it's very unproductive that when I say what we are doing that someone by default conclude that we don't support Gay Prides, workers in the factories, independent media, because I didn't mention in my introductory speech, because lot of us are members of other organizations and groups also, they cook food for the poor, they work in independent media... So this is not the only place of our identity and it's not a point, but I think that it's really exhausting that every time, as if it some kind of apology, we have to put on everything that someone deems important in activism or anarchism, it instantly follows like: «ah, yes, you said you're cultivating carrots, but you didn't mention free software, it's important – specially today in this digital age». I think we should be more oriented to learning from each other what each of us knows,

and our focus on this thing is because we're at it now, we have results, and we really can teach other people, and there is a million of things that we could learn from other people who teach us some things from different sectors that are equally important to us.

Sanja: Ok, I would just like to ask Marko, because Dražen spoke more – you'll get a word (probably to someone from the audience). Recently an Anarchist Bookfair has been held in Zagreb, so if you could just briefly introduce it?

Marko: Well, ouch (laughter)... (to Dražen) Don't you laugh, I won't speak about that... Well, ok...

So the Anarchist Bookfair manifestation is held in Zagreb, and this was the second Anarchist Bookfair; first was in fact Balkan Anarchist Bookfair. This second one was in some way specific, because it opened some interesting themes, and maybe one of the most interesting themes – I guess that such things happen when different people gather and try to come to common conclusions, to compare their experiences, and I think it's also happening here in some way – is that quite often with this manifestations... So we had the bookfair, books were sold, some material given for free, there were some lectures... but everything stays, or often stays, on the level of some kind of festival and manifestation of something we want, but there are a few concrete realizations, not much is realized after such manifestations, after any demonstration, after anything else as well. On the other hand, if there were no such happenings as the bookfair I don't know of the other places where people could find informations about what's going on or where they could join such manifestations.

Sanja: Are you satisfied with the manifestation?

Marko: Well the bookfair was, like, super, except one small incident that we had, but I wouldn't go into that now. (laughter) In fact it's very interesting that it was shown that such happenings, especially if they are organized in the way that doesn't necessarily call for some specific group of people, that in fact different people come with different interests from different reasons they are interested in such happenings, that kind of literature, and I estimate that there was...

Ratibor, what do you think – was there two thousand people?

Ratibor: Certainly, at least two thousands, if not five... (laughter in the audience)

Marko: Hm...

Divna: Hi, I am Divna, I would like to ask why the 11.thesis was forbidden to exhibit their material at ASK?

Marko: The 11.thesis was not forbidden to show their material, but it was agreed – because there were no clear criteria about who and how can exhibit at the bookfair – that 11.thesis can't have their own stand but they could have their magazine in agreement with someone other at his stand, and it's then simply a matter of what someone wants at his stand.

Publika: Something more about the functioning of the publishing house, and it's history in general.

Marko: Ok, the publishing house is functioning on the basis of everyone's wish to engage and the way they want to engage. In fact there are ten people who work, either by writing something, or as people who do proof reading, translations, propose something. There is a very fluid editorial conception, the one that's not very clear. In fact my role is to do greater part of it and to push some things (laughter), but I also make some connection between all those people who do it all.

But I think that this publishing recently slowed down, because of this bookstore that was opened and that takes too much money and everything. The problem I see in such projects that cost a lot of money is that it's really hard to do them as volunteers. The whole thing is voluntary, including that bookstore that takes, like, half of life; and the things in fact halted somewhere at that point, although they are still happening, that publishing is still working, but as long as it is based on enthusiasm there's that much engagement and that much energy.

But the whole thing is pretty much structureless, if I can say it like that – there is no clear conception what each of us does, but people simply decide: «ok, I'd do this translation», and so the things are happening at that level, more like friendly atmosphere then formal.

Romić: Do we have any information about the end of discussion, or is this just fade-out?

Sanja: Well, the time is not limited, but if all people leave... we would not stay. (reaction from the technician) Limited? Can he ask a question? One more question?

Romić: Well I'd like to get back to the bookfair and the question why was 11.thesis was not there. I wouldn't go into details, it's not important, but I think that these discussions about anarchism, that if it has a label of anar-

chism – that becomes a platform for legitimation. And that when we speak about the ideal, the ideal individual, who is going to be in the ideal society, that it's one very, very powerful idea and that most of these things recently fall down to mutual delegitimation, when someone takes others legitimation – because he's not radical enough. That happened, in my experience, not only at Anarchist Bookfair, I've noticed some of it here also, I tried to provoke a discussion... When Indimedia show up almost the same thing occurred: at one point Indimedia became that ideal media platform and everything, and very soon we got into situation that Indimedia has a legitimation, it's an independent media, and whoever does anything else he's not doing it right or not radically enough, or whatever. So I think that the theme is in which way the idea of anarchism - above all else because it is connected to the story about the ideal – becomes a platform for legitimation, and how to deal with it.

I tried to provoke you, so I said that at one point when you're long enough within the scene, that in fact you don't want to talk anymore about anarchism but to do something, but if like this discussion something has a label of anarchist, I have a feeling that it's ok to tell why I don't want to mention anarchism and the thing that people in fact are expecting us to talk about. I think that it's a point that needs to be articulated.

Sanja: You don't need an answer or you're expecting some question?

Romić: Well, I'd like Aleksa Gilijanin to say something about that...

Sanja: Aleksa... Well I think that we don't have enough time – it's limited after all so Aleksa will have to answer some other time. This was a discussion Contemporary Tendencies in Anarchism, thank you for coming... Marko has one more comment...

Marko: Yes... (laughter from the audience)

Sanja: Thank you for coming, next theme is Feminism And Anarchism...

This text is a transcript of a discussion concerning Contemporary tendencies in anarchism in the frame of the Discussions on Anarchism, held on 15th of May 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers: Misha Mashina, Dražen Šimleša and Marko Strpić.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Difficulties in Articulating Anarchafeminism as a Position of Action or as a Theoretical and Political Movement

Sanja Petkovska

I decided to take part in panel discussions held in Dom omladine in Belgrade during the spring 2006, mostly for experimental reasons. I was interested to see how I, a twenty-five year old woman at the time engaged in education, feminism, poetry, and socio-cultural anthropology, would position myself against the listener and me during a lively discussion, and what would come out as a product of that creative event of communication. On this occasion, I would like to write a small analysis of my speech based on the transcript I have received, and to outline the basic theses on which I wanted to elaborate with other participants in that panel whom I considered my interlocutors from my point of view.

Firstly, I was too weak when trying to have a say, but it's easy to stop someone speaking when you have intention to, and when I'm not in the mood to make war for a word. Many felt the need to speak instead of me – other than that being unnecessary, I had to put in a double effort to keep the situation under control. To all of those who need precise sources that I cite here, I can only say this: it is possible that someone before me said what I am saying now, but honestly, I don't really care. It is up to the reader and listener to do a part of the job. I don't think that I need to simply serve a finished product when I write or speak. I advocate unfinished products exclusively, like the Linux operating system, and I point out to anyone who wants meaningless confrontation as a counter-revolutionary plague for every creative thought. The question of the victim and the executioner is a virtual question which can be answered politically only in a virtual world. Bill Gates put it well when he said that you can be equal in a virtual world! Indeed, why bother to try and do the same in the real one?

I would like to start with differentiating two categories of human beings: sex and gender. Their differentiation is a result of the development of linguistic and socio-cultural theories of language, which have been indicating persistently to us what conservative nominalists simply refuse to accept: we do not know whether naming outside world describes material occurrences

or representations in our minds, nor do we know the border with which we could delineate the given (or, as they like to say, natural) from the artificial, which is an intervention resulting from an attempt to bring our ideas and conceptions into “reality”.

Invoking Roland Barthes, we can say that language is not innocent and that it doesn't give us any pure knowledge of the outside world or of ourselves. It is a mediated creation, and for that reason – a relative one. Relativity that is brought by constructionism into social theory and practice, which I definitely do not want to consider as separate categories, is a trap, as much as it is the last refuge of utopian efforts which are, you are guessing - only relatively utopian – now, precisely because of that intervention, or “the language twist”. We say “woman” and know exactly what we mean – a person who is giving birth, who has a womb and breasts, and wider hips than “the opposite sex”, who is characterized with certain social roles, attitudes, behavior – this all comes to mind when we hear this word. However, Stoller has made a very important distinction, according to Kate Miller, “all that isn't” the same category. It is not implicit that a certain biological constitution has a predetermined social, psychological or political meaning. In his book “Abnormal” Michael Foucault gives firm evidence why the society is trying to control the relation between biologic and physiologic characteristics of an individual and his/her behavioral and social characteristics with categorizations and legal and medical norms (especially how sexuality is expressed, roles in the family as a prescribed basic social community, attitude towards one's own body, enabled or hindered independence in decision-making, etc.). However, social control mechanisms find a problem here: individuals whose biological sex is not defined, hermaphrodites etc. – what kind of behavior should be expected from them? If it is possible that someone does not have a defined sex, why is it not possible that a social role deriving from a particular sex is not variable as well? Homosexual men living with a woman who was a man before, or a traditional nuclear family in which man and woman share household chores and are both employed and take care of children – a utopian idea? Although anarchism and feminism had certain shared points, looking in historical retrospect, both were not formulated, theoretically or practically. Case in point is Emma Goldman, whose opinions on many issues fall under liberal feminism (distribution of work, family roles etc.). Because of her connections with other persons associated with anarchism, she is regarded as one of the most important anarchafeminists. In her book *Anarchism and Other Essays* she recommends that a woman should be obedient, that it should be clear who is doing what, what kind of job is befitting, etc. This has nothing to do with anarchafeminism.

This is a good moment to use another ideal construction to describe the development of feminism, which almost paralleled the so-called liberation of

man and Enlightenment fantasies, initiated popular revolutions, fight for the right to vote, and further articulation of the manner in which more powerful social structures colonized all less powerful individuals from various gender, racial, cultural, ethnic, and other groups. Although the communication of struggles, to use the words of Hardt and Negri, between feminism and anarchism would bring a sufficiently broad theoretic and practical platform for fundamental redefinition of human relations on all criteria, this is not happening. Feminism is usually disputed as a “bourgeois activity” or an “activity of a civil sector and civic affiliation”. I consider such conclusions as a groundless leftist struggle using the most simple, most effective and most improper mechanisms to disqualify an interlocutor by simple, continuous returning to the question of their legitimacy to speak at all.

Schematically and descriptively speaking, there are “circles of freedom” in the feminist theory and they mostly tend to spread the examination of the role given to the woman in the society, but also of the most intimate issues of her physicality, and the manner in which she is represented in the society. The main model for this story is a classification given by Elisabeth Grosz in her book “Volatile bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism”, although a more or less similar description of the development of feminism can be found with some other authors. Criteria for Elizabeth’s classification of these three main currents of feminism were: the scope of freedoms requested by authors and activists, their social activity and methods used to influence public opinion or social conscience, and articulation of differences between sex and gender.

Liberal, egalitarian feminism is associated with names like Mary Wollstonecraft, Betty Friedan, etc. To present their main requests and views roughly and in a simplified way, their position was that women should get some privileges in the existing capitalist civil order that was developing, and, above all, that there should be a general acknowledgement that women, as general political subjects, have a right to vote equally as men. Categories of public and private space remained uninterruptedly opposite, as they did during socialist or union feminism. Generally speaking, the authors of this second wave of feminism concentrated their requests around the equal right to work, equal position when working, and equal position in the socialist movement. They mapped out patriarchy as a position of power of men, who provide economic and cultural domination over women, as part of a wider struggle against capitalism and economic oppression. At first they had acted together with men against capitalism, but later on they came to the conclusion that men put their issues aside, so they added anti-capitalism as a key request among others. Furthermore, they brought up a very important issue of gender distribution of work, questioning the idea that a woman’s place is in the house. Women workers were bringing down these stereotypes. It is very risky to simplify complex constructions this way, and I surely didn’t mean to say that anything

characterized as a key aspect of a movement is its highest point or goal, since a coherent positioning of a group of theoreticians and activists by one another is a matter of interpretation of certain theses or certain social action practices. For example, Donna Haraway was named as one of the references of the socialist feminism movement in the Wikipedia article on the issue, as was Emma Goldman, who were two completely different historical figures, both without direct connections to socialism. Therefore, it is quite debatable what should be the determining criterion of consideration, and variations are considerable. Grozs, for example, placed Simone de Beauvoir in the first group of feminist theoreticians, but we must not forget that her typology was made according to the criterion of attitude toward the body and the concept of body represented by that theoretician, since Simone was a member of Existentialist and Marxist circle. She included psychoanalysts such as Julia Kristeva in the second group, as well as many other Marxist feminists. Perhaps the most important characteristic which this feminist movement brings is that it connects class struggle with the struggle against patriarchy, but I cannot make a judgment on the extent to which that was a subsequent interpretation of post-Marxists, or how much socialists such as Clara Zetkin distinguished patriarchy as a concept of male dominance and oppression from the general oppression of working class by owners of production resources. Third-wave feminism is the most complicated to define as heterogeneous, because criteria for distinguishing these authors are very complex. One of the additional criteria that might help is the time period of the authors. We can include all authors who connect feminism with post-modernism, post-colonial studies, the queer theory and Black Women's movement which emphasized that the specific position of black women differed from that of white women, but also radical feminism and cyber feminism, Riot Grrrl movement and all the names we can link to those movements, such as Judith Butler or Andrea Dworkin – two completely different feminists. Some of them fought against pornography; some used pornography to fight the stereotype of a woman as a whore who should express her sexuality under the strict control of man unless she wants to be perceived that way. Wikipedia's article on third-wave feminism does not include a single link which would associate it to anarchafeminism or Riot Grrrl movement, for example, whereas the first reference after the article on anarchafeminism is radical feminism – the most notorious feminist movement, by the way, which made many enemies by insisting on gender relations as a key point of social inequalities and efforts against pornography. The Political Correctness movement could also be associated with radical feminism, but not exclusively, because it was more broadly linked to post-structuralism. Embittered Bob Black wrote a rather misogynic essay titled *Feminism as Fascism*, which nicely presented the stereotypes that leftists and men in general have about feminists, and how they identify them with one general

stereotype. For Black, women in general, feminists and radical feminists are characterized as the same thing many times in that essay.

A very fine description of contradictions and hypocrisy that are present in the leftist movement and the feminist movement and broadly speaking sexual difference movement was given by Anja Meulenbelt in her book that was published here by Feminist 94 – “The Shame is Over”. I have omitted to add something about pop culture and the LGBTTIQ movement and feminism, such as Decadent Action, which is a very subversive anarchist idea with the potential to be united with many feminist fractions, but that greatly exceeds my ambitions for this occasion. In my view, anarchafeminism embraces a set of assumptions from all three waves of feminism, but we can conclude that the problem to position feminism doesn’t end there. In any case, I do not consider anarchafeminism to be close to radical feminism, and I associate it mostly with second-wave and third-wave feminism, cyber feminism and decadent anarchism. One of the central categories that highlight fundamental examination of gender relations is the category of human relations, because that category provides the easiest way to represent many aspects of inequality. It is not often that we see the issue of gender or, earlier, position of women, mentioned in the works of classical and more contemporary anarchism. Female followers of anarchistic ideas were mostly supporting their male colleagues, and were rarely presented as movement leaders. Even after the end of the Spanish Civil War, we saw separate women’s organizations, which indicates that, at the time, those women recognized certain incompatibility of interests, insufficient willingness of men to deal with their issues, according to the well-known way of thinking whereby human relations are solved by revolutionary changes, because when the crucial moment comes – nothing will ever be the same. And we see whether it is or isn’t the same.

However, as an activist and a person interested in politics and social sciences, with all knowledge available to me during the last two decades, particularly about utopian communities, communes, and about the non-governmental sector, I would like to stress that it is becoming increasingly clear that violent and oppressive models of behavior are reflected in human relations and group dynamics, and that every movement based on some old fashioned or naïve vision is inadequate when proposing specific strategies and fighting weapons which provide different solutions. All nuances that exist in the leftist and feminist movements, as well as all significant differences, demand their great efforts as they dwell in the closed circle on the margin of the society, which is why I am not optimistic. As an individual, I speak for myself; I use those small strategies that are available to me to reorganize the world I deal with every day. In my life I have worked for non-governmental organizations and in the private sector, I have graduated from college, and therefore, I can hardly be considered a fierce opponent of the system, and anyone who holds

it against me, as one member of the panel's audience did, that I am no more than a political opportunist is correct to an extent. On the other hand, I have no interest at all in moralizing old-timer's stories; I believe that anarchafeminism is an attitude, a fundamental disapproval of the way the world is set up and of the way relations of power are positioned in it, a fundamental opposition to the violence understood only as a disregard of other people's will and their right to use equal quantities of material resources as others. It is a lucid invitation to confront every attempt to crush the will of independent thought and action, and creative dealing with the system. If the Riot Grrrl movement weren't so associated with punk music that I've stopped listening and that is not enjoyable to me any more, and if it were associated a bit more with political and social theory, maybe we would have an example of "an ideal" anarchafeminist action. An anarchafeminist woman is someone who, in political sense, is a bitch, who is not afraid to experiment or work for the government, who is ready to take risks in theoretical and sexual sense, and believes in justice. She does not care if she is misunderstood.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Feminism and Anarchism

Vanda Perovic

Anarchism and feminism aren't codified ideologies but movements that are hard to define, as there exists more than one anarchism and feminism. In fact, there is a wide range of anarchisms and feminisms. They have been developing for more than two centuries in different directions. Taking some of the most simple definitions of anarchism and feminism and saying that anarchism is a free community of equal and free individuals and that feminism is the constant fight of women against male domination, we can conclude that these are emancipatory movements. That is to say, anarchism as well as feminism are oriented towards liberation – feminism towards the emancipation of women, and anarchism towards the emancipation of women and men.

As emancipatory movements they are left-wing movements, anarchism being on the radical left and feminism generally on the left. These movements are subversive in relation to the existing values of a society, wishing to change them, and for this reason are often unwanted in that society. This undesirability has led anarchism and feminism into a difficult situation as regards the public, because society, in defending itself, obscures the terms of anarchism and feminism and, as a deterrent, manipulates them in every possible way to show them in a negative context. Consequently, it's not easy to find somebody publicly saying: I'm a feminist, and even less: I'm an anarchist. But there are also the braver ones, who would say that they are anarchists and/or feminists, and many of them are here this evening.

Anarchism as well as feminism are movements that have had their ups and downs. In certain historical situations they have had very many supporters and a very strong impact, in other historical moments they have simply died out. Anarchism is often compared to a river, a mighty river, which at a certain moment suddenly becomes a subterranean stream. Referring to feminism, we talk about waves of feminism, which means that there is a discontinuity in effect. But what's for sure, as these two centuries have shown, is that these ideas will always exist, no matter if they are directly present in society or not.

...

The Attitude of Anarchism towards Feminism

According to its definition, anarchism includes feminism, because anarchism opposes all aspects of authority and hierarchy, which means it is against state,

against capital, against church, and, important for feminism, against patriarchy. However, like all the movements of that time, historical anarchism was a male-dominated movement and the male anarchists didn't write anything or go into any detail concerning the future position of women. Ultimately, they were only children of their time.

Proudhon, the founder of anarchism, was overtly misogynous and wished it to be understood that women can only be mothers or whores; he wanted to change all the values of society, but not the relations within the family. Women anarchists were confronted with discrimination – with sexism, however you wish to call it, in anarchist circles, and of course in relation to society, which was radically different. They wrote much more about the question of women, and in a more detailed way, than male anarchists.

...

In the eighties of the 19th century, the centre of the anarchist movement moved from Europe to America, following the big emigration from Russia and Central Europe. The departing emigrants carried with them new ideas about socialism, social democracy and anarchism.

Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman and many other future anarchists arrived in America, which at that time was experiencing the stormy age of industrialization. This was the time of the big political activities of trade unions, strikes, meetings, bombs... Emma Goldman arrived directly from the Petersburg factory to the American factory and her disappointment was great. Escaping from one exploitation, one had arrived at another exploitation. After the Haymarket bomb in 1887 and under the influence of the unfair trial, in which four anarchists were sentenced to death in 1887, Emma Goldman left for New York and got to know Alexander Berkman and Johann Most, publisher of an influential anarchist newspaper.

After having completed her knowledge of English, Emma Goldman became one of the most famous agitators and theorists of anarchism in America. She was tirelessly travelling and giving lectures on anarchism in relation to various themes: the freedom of press, militarism, capitalism, education, the emancipation of women, marriage and love, woman-trafficking, the right to vote, prisons, patriotism. She was one of the first to begin to fight for the right to information about contraception.

...

The essence of Emma Goldman's writings is that she identified patriarchy as the basic locus of women's oppression, and the classical family as the place where women are oppressed and deprived of their rights. She claimed that the disenfranchisement of women differs from the disenfranchisement of men, both in its causes and its effects. A woman is doubly disenfranchised: in a patriarchal society, because she is a woman, and in an unjust society, as a worker and citizen. The patriarchal family and patriarchy stand for the ideology of

domination. She considers the family to be the source of women's oppression and disenfranchisement, the place of sexual repression and forced motherhood, the place where the free development of a woman's personality is restricted. She thought that women themselves have to fight for a better position in society by becoming personalities and desisting from being sexual objects. In her opinion, women have a right to love and sexual satisfaction, but if women are the only ones to emancipate themselves while society doesn't change, this would be the tragedy of women's emancipation, because they would remain without appropriate partners. Untiringly – and risking imprisonment, which she suffered twice - she gave lectures about women's rights to decide on their bodies, including the right to sexual education and contraception, which she considered of primary importance.

...

Following my preoccupation with Emma Goldman, I wanted to see if there is a trace of this big anarchist wave rolling over Europe in 19th century Serbia, and I encountered Jelena Ilka Marković. I've now completed her biography. As a feminist-oriented historian, it's my task to produce new knowledge about women's activities, to connect scattered items of information, and to assess them and inscribe them into the mainstream history written by men. My thesis is that Jelena Ilka Marković, the woman who shot at King Milan in 1882 (but missed him), wife of the influential politician and officer Jevrem Marković and daughter-in-law of Svetozar Marković, the first Serbian socialist, was not only a desperate widow shooting at King Milan to avenge her husband's murder four years earlier. I believe she definitely also had political motives, which originated from her clear political attitude and her posture in the immediate but also wider ideological context of anarchism and the Russian 'People's Will' movement (Narodnaya Volya), and I think I can prove this. My special work is Jelena Ilka Marković's biography, and my MA thesis will be the political aspect of her assassination. In the archive of the City of Belgrade I have read 450 pages related to her case, trial and inquiry, and I believe that there are definite proofs of her strong political attitude regarding the kind of government King Milan was leading and therefore of her political motivation. Until now, historians have only been interested in the question of whether the assassination was part of a larger group conspiracy. It was not a larger group conspiracy – at most, a plot by two women. In my view, this assassination can be seen in the context of European history, especially of the anarchist assassinations of that time and of the assassination of the Russian Tsar, in which women participated also.

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning feminism and anarchism in the frame of the Talks on Anarchism, held on 1st June 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers: Vanda Perović, Sanja Petkovska & Milica Gudović. This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Erasing of Context Through Hyper-Production

Vladan Jeremić

We will take a look at art from the political aspect and at interpretation of art through political systems, look at how they overlap, and the relationship between art and anarchism. We will examine how the ideas of freedom and autonomy in the politics and art developed together and how they overlapped, starting at the end of the 18th century during Enlightenment and throughout the 19th century and a fast development of capitalist relations and the bourgeois society. As the capitalist civil society developed, art became liberated from church and classic institutions, as well as from dwelling under dominant classes. A paradigm about an autonomous artist who can change the society with his work was developed during Romanticism. Anarchism of the 19th century was based on the political activity and struggle against all forms of domination and governance that was separated from the people. Artists who created their own autonomy also shared views of anarchists. Let's mention some of the cases from the 19th century which constitute these relations.

Gustave Courbet is a well known French artist, and also a revolutionary of the Paris Commune. His artistic work initiated the so-called Social Realism, i.e. Realism in painting. On the other hand, Courbet demolished various bourgeois symbols and monuments (for example, the Vendome column) and was an active member of the Communal Council. During the Communards' fight against the bourgeoisie, he lucidly advised that artwork could be used in the revolutionary fight by using the paintings of Botticelli, Raphael and other ancient masters from the Louvre as barricades. During the second half of the 19th century, the poet Mallarmé publicly supported anarchists during a court procedure. Rimbaud abandoned the role of a bourgeois poet despising it, and left for Africa. Tolstoy liberated serfs of the taxes and fees by giving them land and creating a kind of a free co-operative...

However, art as we know it today emerged in the conditions of the nascent bourgeois society and the rise of the capitalist production, so that symbolic language used by artists in the production of artworks is the language formed in the culture of capitalist relations.

During the 20th century and the modernist project that was striving to change society - thus having an undeniable political role - artistic strategies and initial positive background of the avant-garde got transformed in the means of propaganda of the totalitarian systems, such as fascism. Philosopher Adorno analyzed these aspects in his cultural studies and developed a term culture industry after immigrating to the United States. As historical process progressed over totalitarian and technological eras, art adopted all applicable forms of a cultural product in the culture industry. The development and history of film industry is the best example of this process, and so is the history of popular culture. The illustration and final determination of visual culture industry in the so-called “high” art can be seen in the act of tautological appropriation by Warhol and other pop artists. Same as Adorno, a philosopher of the Frankfurt School, Walter Benjamin, defines the concept of cultural product and emphasizes that “There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism.” Georges Bataille wrote about the Potlatch in culture, i.e. the need to produce excessive materiality, generated by the society itself, in order to destroy it ritually later on.

After the World War II, as state cultural bureaucracies grew stronger, art production was supported by the institutionalized esthetics of blocks of the time. In the East-European cultures, canonized socialist realism held sway, while the paradigm of a free artistic expression was built in the West, filtered through art market and the myth of a great modernist artist. Jackson Pollock produced abstract expressionism, supported by the government and cultural policies of the United States. There is a catalog from 1961 of the exhibition of “Contemporary American Art” which was realized in the American Embassy in Belgrade (in Yugoslavia, a socialist country, with a specific role between two blocks), representing the entire art scene of the time: De Kooning, Pollock, Mark Rothko, etc. – almost all artist of that heroic abstract expressionism.

During those cold war years, the Situationist International begins its activity. Situationist theoretician Guy Debord criticized art heavily, removing from Situationism all those who produced art through the system of institutions and, as he put it – expanded the field of spectacle. Situationists write that culture is a commodity that sells everything else, which seems very modern even today.

The activity of the conceptual artist Joseph Beuys, the “anarchist and shaman”, is very interesting. He gives a definition that “Kunst=Kapital”. Using that, he reflects on the ontological existence of art in the field of capitalism. No matter how much he plays on the verge of excess and politics, Beuys’ freedom still remains in the frame of a specific West Germany’s (Social or Christian Democratic) capitalist system of that period. His political role served as a kind of a mirror (that works as a mediator) for artists living in former East

Germany. Beuys' mirrored subject gave the illusion of extreme liberties, i.e. as much as it was possible that an artist is free in West Germany.

In the current global cultural production, through cultural management and mediation, art is produced in the context of marketing campaigns for financially powerful bodies and companies, cultural tourism, etc. - i.e. sectors which can generate fresh profit. In the age of post-fordism, new museums are built instead of factories, all kinds of things are restored and made into artifacts, festivals are organized in great numbers, same as biennials, music and hybrid festivals, etc.

Already for a long now we find art reduced to the role of decorating neoliberal capitalism, functioning in the form of a mere market product. We see the modification of art into marketing strategies and corporate culture. The heritage of the artistic avant-garde, with its conceptual and visual experiments, is part of today's marketing strategies. For example, we feel free to state that without the collage at the beginning of the 20th century, there would have been no graphical operative computer systems or many other technological-conceptual products. And in a way, with their practice called *détournement*, situationists opened the door for today's models of para-advertising.

In a culture, besides marketing strategies, there is also present a political mediation, which according to the theory of identity, transfers the former partition of society into classes to the paradigm of different identities. In the Balkans, this kind of mediation is very apparent in the recent economic and political processes. Contemporary art is used both as a means for political propaganda and for the expansion of the market. Various brands have been imported from the dominant cultural areas and are implanted by propaganda tools and the media into the market of a subordinated cultural habitat. This transfer of cultural packages is locally put into practice uncritically as a form of "cultural karaoke". At the same time, in these surroundings, particular profiles have developed for dealing with specific tasks in cultural politics. For the initiation of the transition in Eastern European cultures, contemporary art served a position described as "Soros-Realism" (after the name of the foundation mainly financing these kind of programs in Ex-Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe during the nineties). Cultural politics and the agendas they impose are realized through the neoliberal strategies of the free market and with the help of the (European) totalitarian bureaucratic apparatus. We witness the expansion of consumption and cultural hyper-production, the branding of a region and the processes of gentrification providing ground for future economic investments. In Belgrade, Serbia, a good example of the transition process in the arts is the "October Salon", an until now conservative manifestation, which is currently becoming an international biennial, Belgrade meeting the same fate as the other main cities of the region. The

aim is to have an exhibition similar to anywhere else in the region or Europe, the ideal effect being to change the city's global image and to stimulate larger future economic investments.

Throughout its history, institutional art has already repeated the act of recuperation so many times that everything can be offered on its market. Consequently, the art works presented at these kind of biennials and shows look equally unconvincing. All possible kinds of conceptions have already been recuperated a thousand times and multiplied in the digital media. The concept of copyright cannot cope with the contemporary remix culture. The performative has become the manifestation of the spectacle and the creativity of the "virtual bodies"/"avatars" takes place inside of the defined corporate spaces of net games (such as "Second Life"). Context alone is not enough for the affirmation of an art work. Or rather, we observe the erasure of context itself - more precisely, the subsumption of all contexts into one single context, the celebration of capitalist superiority in corporate culture.

As regards the question of context, it is interesting to have a look at exhibitions like the show about the RAF (Red Army Fraction), which was realized in a quite relaxed way some years ago at Kunstwerke in Berlin. Accompanied by a fat catalogue, it promoted an aesthetic image of the RAF, showing art works, films and documentations representing something like the "radical art" we can enjoy today while having a coffee at the gallery's bar. A similar treatment of the issue is exemplified in the worldwide retrospectives concerning the Situationist International during the last few years. They tend to show the situationists in their aesthetic and formal aspects, to the neglect of the true political context. Currently there is a show about SPUR, a section of situationists from Munich. The interpretation of their activities also concentrates on their aesthetic and formal aspects, putting the political in the background. The same process has happened to Dada and Surrealism too, as the phenomenon of these movements has for the most part entered the archives interpreted through the aesthetics and theory of the image, whereas their main aim of changing something through direct action in everyday life (also the main aim of anarchist groups) is disregarded.

In his essay *The Case Against Art*, the anarchist writer John Zerzan criticizes postmodern and other aspects of art and its entrance into civilisation. Zerzan doesn't criticize art as such, but the ways it is presented in a culture. For him, art is problematic because it speaks in a symbolic language mediated through experts who tell us what art is and what we should learn and experience as art.

The majority of artists in the field of anarchism are linked in their activities to postanarchism or queer theory. A large number of participants in the field

of contemporary art consider it inevitable to actively enter the art system, claiming that we cannot neglect it nor find any strategy to avoid it. According to them, it is necessary to enter the system with an rhizomatic idea about relations and to “invisibly” destruct and destroy it through various positions of identity - to play with the system in a way that simply makes its functioning impossible on different levels. This is more or less the current state of the discourse between postanarchism and contemporary art.

The attitude of anarchists towards art has always been critical and entrance into the system (even as an extreme strategy/anti-strategy) especially problematic. Only free play in everyday life can open a space for direct interpersonal contact and direct action and the symbolic models of artistic communication cannot replace that.

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning art and anarchism in the frame of the Discussions on Anarchism, held on 1st October 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers: Vladan Jeremić, Sezgin Boynik, Tadej Kurepa and Milica Ružičić.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Our Ideas are in Everybody's Minds

Sezgin Boynik

There exists a very active group on the Turkish subversive and anarchist scene dealing with the idea of postanarchism. They publish a magazine called *Siyahi*, which is one of the best magazines for theory of culture and critical thinking. The editors are Sureyya Evren and Erden Kosova from Istanbul.

An important component of postanarchism is the search for a rhizomatic or new subject of anarchism. Postanarchists base their strategy on a slogan derived from the gender-queer-anarcho-feministic activities of the seventies, with the idea The personal is the political, leading their strategy to the point of Changing the world without taking power. This starting point is the most important problematic of the postanarchistic tendency, since they can be very easily incorporated and assimilated into the system, although taking very radical actions. For them, it is not important to take the power, but simply to create a new subject. Postanarchists can easily be connected to the situationist idea of the creation of situations, as well as to the work on a complete change of power structures (it is well known that the situationists wanted to achieve this by a practice they called 'détournement').

Erden Kosova has written a review of the Situationist International for the magazine *art-ist*, of which I was the editor and which was published in Istanbul at the end of 2004. Erden's objection was that the new radical situationist position bases itself on the notion of 'récupération' and that it uses this term too often. 'Récupération' is one of the historically most important arguments of the Situationist International. In the first issue of the magazine *Internationale situationniste* (published in June 1958) there is an article *The Bitter Victory of Surrealism*, which advances the thesis that Surrealism and Dada were based on the radical position which Raul Vaneigem names radical radioactive nucleus, which was later very rapidly assimilated into the system of the society of the spectacle. They give two examples: the first is a robot that could write automatic songs, which had been a radical practice of the surrealists before; the second is brainstorming, which had already started being used in the USA in the fifties, inside the system of management.

In the year 1989, at the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris, there was held

the first big retrospective concerning the Situationist International. It is interesting that the place where the exhibition was put on, more precisely the place where the Centre Georges Pompidou was built, was actually the part of the city where the situationists used to conduct their experiments during the sixties, calling their activity 'psychogeography'. In brief, they wanted to research the spatiality of the city or how the city is actually built, by walking around and using different practices, for example 'dérive'. The goal was to find the weak points of the ideological structure of urbanism, using the definition of unitarian urbanism. This quarter of Paris was demolished in 1963, to the protests of the situationists, and in 1989 there was already a big exhibition dedicated to them at this place. At the end of the sixties, Georges Pompidou, the then minister of Internal Affairs, whose name was given to this renowned cultural centre, arrested Vaneigem and Debord several times. Hardly surprising that Debord did not visit this exhibition and that other situationists also refused to support it.

...

In Denmark, the most discussed topic at present is the canonization of culture. The Danish Ministry of Culture has established new canons about which contemporary artworks are to be considered Danish. This is of course a consequence and a continuation of conservative anti-immigration politics. Lars von Trier is one of the artists mentioned, although his movies were once considered radical, and *Idiot* has consequently become one of the canonic movies. In this canon, the Ministry considers some fifteen pieces of art in music, film and painting as representing the cultural matrix of „Danishness“. In painting, they have chosen Asger Jorn, more precisely his series of modifications that operate with the 'détournement' of images and objects found at the flea market and of worthless kitsch paintings he has transformed into a critical and revolutionary visuality. We could give a lot of examples of 'récupération'...

...

Halil Altindere from Istanbul repeated on an oil-painting by a local Turkish artist what the artist Alexander Brener did in 1997 (Brener painted a dollar with a green spray onto a painting by Kazimir Maljevič in the Stedelijk Museum of Amsterdam, and ended up in prison). Halil repeated this gesture a few months after Brener, painting a dollar as a practice of destruction of an aesthetical position that had become commodificated.

It is interesting to note what happened to Altindere afterwards. He was not arrested immediately like Brener, but was ordered to pay a fee of around 5000 dollars. With the help of a lawyer, he succeeded in reversing the verdict of the court, appealing to the fact that he was an artist. In this way, if an artist makes an intervention on a work of another artist, it becomes an improved art piece. It is not destruction, but an artistic act, which later even raises the price of

the artwork. This is a real example of 'récupération' on the contemporary art market. It is known that Brener himself used this "being-an-artist strategy", when he avoided getting beaten up in Moscow after attacking a member of Parliament, saying that it was actually an artistic performance.

In any case, the connection between art and anarchism as radical thinking is very problematic. For example, the above mentioned magazine 'art-ist' from the very beginning supported Brener and Barbara Schurz, publishing their texts through this collaboration. When they were staying in Istanbul for the first time, we conducted an interview on the occasion of the incident at Manifesta in Ljubljana. Brener and Schurz intervened during the panel discussion on contemporary art of an elite circle, by writing with a spray Demolish neoliberalist multiculturalist art system now!. They found themselves imprisoned again, until Miran Mohar from IRWIN got them out. The editors of 'art-ist' decided not to publish any more issues about Manifesta, Documenta and the biennials, but in 2004 they invited Brener and Schurz as radical activists to edit the new issue of 'art-ist', dedicated to Alfredo Bonanno. Alfredo Bonanno is a radical anarchist who stands for insurrectionism and has been several times imprisoned since the seventies. Bonanno does not commit himself to theory but to a real and active approach. He is a classical humanist, who does not involve himself with theories of postanarchism (which focus on the deconstruction of the subject, non-placement, deterritorialisation etc.). In Bonanno's work, on the contrary, the modern subject longing for the basic, better life beyond exploitation still exists. This was also a thesis of the situationists, who were for a real Hegelian subject, a modern subject that knows what it wants and is today actually being destroyed through exploitation and the society of spectacle. They have formulated the statement Our ideas are in everybody's minds, but in my view we cannot see it this way anymore, because we have become recuperated too much, incorporated and commodified in the society of the spectacle.

When the Boston Institute for Contemporary Art made an exhibition on situationists in 1989 (the same year as in Paris). It was curated by Elizabeth Sussman. For her, the comparison between contemporary artists and situationist ideas was very important. Elisabeth inverted the statement Our ideas are in everybody's minds in a tricky way and pointed out that situationist ideas were even in the minds of artists making appropriation art such as Robert Longo, Jenny Holzer, Barbara Kruger etc...

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning art and anarchism in the frame of the Talks on Anarchism, held on 1st of October 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers Sezgin Boynik, Vladan Jeremić, Tadej Kurepa and Milica Ružičić.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.rs>

Stani Pani Collective

Igor Todorović

Stani Pani Kolektiv (SPK) arose in May 2002, when a group of people decided to start organizing illegal – free parties in the nature and benefit parties for various manifestations and events.

“... a PARTY, as we imagine it, is a journey in another world by active participation in a creative process. For the duration of the party, the SPACE in which it is happening, is not subjected to the laws and prejudices ruling in the world around us. The SPACE becomes for these hours a realized UTOPIA, a place where druids and high-tech fetishists meet for a game of chess. Experiences and positive energy is shared and the party becomes the starting point from which these realized ideas and emotions extend further... Join in!!! You are part of the network, too!” (from: <http://stanipanikolektiv.com>)

Some knew each other from before, from the psychedelic world of underground clubbing, from the hardcore/punk subcultural streams or from the anti war campaigns and the radical activist scene. Soon joined new people as well and everybody brought her or his part of the puzzle and in the end the collective developed into a huge body, a platform, which allowed the individuals to realize their ideas. The main principles of our activities are: autonomy, antihierarchy, non profitability and the fight against all forms of discrimination and oppression. The group doesn't define itself as anarchist, because some of the members don't wish to declare themselves as anarchists. They think that this would open problematic questions and they don't want to be pigeonholed. Anyway, there exists a consensus about the importance of autonomy, the absence of hierarchy and the common aim to fight against discrimination and everyday oppression we find both on local level and in the broader society.

Stani Pani Kolektiv took part in various squat actions, that means we occupied empty rooms of abandoned houses and buildings. The first of these actions was in Dobračina street. In an old, quite derelict villa some rooms were repaired and for some time some groups have been living there. The squat in Dobračina street deteriorated after a certain time. This happened exclusively because of violence by some individuals who came there. There were a number of violent incidents caused by a quite decadent group of people that attacked the ones that were really living there. Therefore people had to move out...

The following action with huge enthusiasm is linked to the building at the Branko Bridge; people went inside, brought it in order and cleaned its vast rooms. Some people had the idea to legalize or half-legalize the stay there. The building belonged to a bankrupt company and the status of property was debatable. So some people went to the city administration and tried to explain that they would like to establish a cultural centre or an art space there. The city would give a usage permission for the building and in this way it would be possible to work there undisturbed. In return the groups would maintain the abandoned space. The city reacted with great delight about the young people who are willing to do something, etc..., and promised to help. The following day there was a public notification at the building. The door was sealed and from that very moment every step inside the building became a criminal act. Lots of our things stayed locked inside: armchairs, chairs, furniture we had brought or got from people who didn't need them any more.

Shortly before the Peoples Global Action Congress in 2004 near Belgrade, there was squatted an old house in Kralja Milutina street. In this house lived Roma and homeless people and in the same backyard was the DŽKC Club. Everything worked fine for a few months, as long as there was enough enthusiasm, but by-and-by there came less and less people. In the house stayed as well activists on their journey through. Some time there was water and electricity. Later all ended up, because there was no enthusiasm or will to do something concrete. The city government tore down the house in the end and kicked the people out. Now there is a fence around the old houses in this backyard and one is waiting for an investor.

There took place lots of benefit parties and illegal parties in the nature, mainly with trance music. At the benefit parties we collected optional donations through symbolic tickets and by the time we had enough money to buy a whole sound system: amplifier, loudspeakers, cables etc. We lend the equipment for every event that we like to support and normally people give a symbolic amount of money between 5 and 10 Euro for transport and maintaining of the equipment. Sometimes we have problems with the transport, but we always find some friends to help out.

SPK participated in a joint project with activists from Prishtina called Road to Peace and with this was realized an important collaboration. People from here went to Prishtina and people from Prishtina came to Belgrade. There were cultural programs, political debates and discussions, etc. We worked on securing the stay of a number of caravans journeying through Belgrade. Last year (2005) came the peace caravan for Palestine, which consisted of around hundred busses, trucks and cars. Activists from whole Europe had come to hold demonstrations, actions, workshops or the like. In Belgrade we had together a presentation in REX. That year marked the 10th anniversary of the Srebrenica massacre and it came to a very brutal fight with local fascist

groups, with teargas and physical violence.

2005 was organized the first peace caravan through ex-Yugoslavia by the regional network for conscientious objection. The caravan started in Croatia, crossed Bosnia, Serbia and Macedonia and finished in Thessalonica in Greece. This year it took place again in May and it was one bus full of activists from the whole region. This time it started in the South, in Skopje, and stayed in Prishtina in Kosovo, where happened an incident in which one activist from Croatia was injured with a knife by an unknown aggressor. This year will be founded a group that will deal with the promotion of the demilitarization of our region. The idea is that the activist scene from all states of the region unites to realize bigger and stronger actions.

Another initiative that already lasts for some time should come to an end now. It is the translation of the book *We Are Everywhere*. This is a book of 520 pages with stories written down by activists from the whole world about the fight against capitalism, NATO, G8, etc. The people that own the rights of the book left the graphic design to us, the money for the printing is collected and we will hand out the book for free.

SPK participated in a big number of protests and one of the most recent has been against the destruction of the Fifth (Peti) Park at Zvezdara. Probably you have heard about the legal or half legal usurpation of the park. Some investor got the right to destroy the children's park and to build his building. The citizens organized themselves to protect their park and made some noise in the media. During the stay of the international caravan of art and activism and together with activists from the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany etc. SPK organized a solidarity protest in the Fifth Park.

The campaign NE U NATO (NOT IN NATO) was a joint initiative by various groups, collectives and individuals, which later died off because of constant personal conflicts and disagreements. I hope that we will again succeed to work on the spreading of information and the raise of the public consciousness about the meaning of the accession to the "Atlantic integration". At benefit parties we collected money to print stickers and we had a graffiti campaign NE U NATO, too. Another graffiti campaign referred to the abuse of a boy by a member of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The collective organized with other groups a protest in front of McDonalds at Terazije on 16th October 2005, which was already the eleventh protest in row organized by us and other people.

At the international day of the fight against international companies we gave cooked food for free and leaflets to the people. The action was quite successful, as I think, as we handed out a very huge amount of leaflets. We had a big table, good music, janglers and many people came to support the action.

In the most recent initiative "Food Not Bombs" we as well give out food

for free. It was intended to take place in the frame of an action called “Free Space”. The idea was to create every Saturday, when Kralja Milana street is free of traffic, a free space for having parties, various protests and free speech about current problems in society. After the first Saturday, which went quite good, we didn’t manage to organize another one, because the police asked for the permission of the communal inspection. In the communal inspection they told us after one week without explanation that we didn’t get the permission, although we started the process at time. They said that if we still tried to organize the meeting we would get a fine about 20.000 Dinars. We refrained from the action as we weren’t sure if we could afford such costs. Of course we will go on trying, as this is the most fresh and original idea we thought out. Maybe there is the chance to move to some other quarter at the periphery, where they would leave us in peace. These are most of the activities we had in the last few years.

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning activism and anarchism in the frame of the Talks on Anarchism, held on 17th October 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers Edgar Buršić i Igor Todorović.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Monteparadiso

Edgar Buršić

Monteparadiso developed from an informal collective to the formal organisation it is today. We started in 1992 with the organisation of concerts at the Casoni Vecchi fortress. The fortress was neglected and overgrown by grass and bushes, we cleaned it up and began to hang around there. The place is in a quarter of Pula called in Italian “Monteparadiso”, so we overtook this name for our collective. We started to organise Monteparadiso hardcore punk festivals, back then we were teenagers between 14 and 18 years old, loving underground music, punk and hardcore. The first festival took place in 1992.

We had to lock up our space in the fortress to avoid to attract drug addicts, for Monteparadiso is notorious as a drug quarter. The second bigger festival we had in 1993 with a bit more international bands. We cared about having low prices for entrance and drinks and always offered food for free. We were angry teens and considered all these festivals too commercial. We wanted to organize something ultra cheap and ultra noncommercial, where everybody could do what she or he wants. This went on for some years and was in the main connected to music.

1997 we had to found a citizen's group to be able to go on with the organisation of concerts and we registered an organisation named Monteparadiso. In this time it was most important for us to work with music, which was the height of activism for us, punk bands singing something about anarchism. We quickly understood that this was not enough for us and that we would like to do something more. 1999 we moved from the fortress to the former barracks Karlo Rojc. The barracks were built in the end of the 19th century and during the history there were stationed the austrian-hungarian, italian and in the end, until 1991, the Yugoslavian army. To the Rojc first moved refugees from Bosnia, who stayed until 1996. After that the building was more or less neglected, it remained only organisations that had been doing humanitarian work while the refugees lived there.

In the void between the refugees and some general undefined status of the building, the first ones that started to work there were various bands and other organisations. The city gouvernement told us that we would have to pay 15 kuna/m² for a space of 100m². We moved in, but never wanted to pay. We took

400m² more to go on with other activities and helped also other organisations to find space. The barracks looked not so nice in some moment, as many people came and stole various things, like installations for heating, radiators, windows and other elements of the building. There was a lot of material as the barracks are huge, before 1991 there were over 7000 soldiers there.

In one moment there had come together a very large number of organisations and the city decided to give everything to them, but with the obligation to pay. Not one single organisation wanted to pay, because all had to build everything on their own and the city paid only water and electricity. The building is still in the ownership of the Foreign Ministry of Croatia¹, but given to the city for use, so that the legal situation is not precisely regulated. The city in the end accepted the fact that nobody would pay, but that we can talk about building alterations. At the moment there are working 77 quite different organisations² there. There is us with our Monteparadiso Hacklab, which is connected to media activism, free software and use of new technologies, there is a Roma kindergarten, a group of the Macedonian minority, Hungarian und Serbian minorities have a space as well as some organisations of disabled persons, aerobic clubs etc. There is anything and everything, as well what we don't like, because besides organisations that are useful for the community there are also organisations that succeeded somehow to legalize their private business telling the story about "building up the civil society".

What has all this to do with anarchism? Not too much. In my opinion, approaching anarchism means to do something for the community, but in the community there are not only anarchists. It is important that things that are reserved for the rich can be used by the whole community. For that we are spreading wireless internet through the whole city. Who likes to, can put up an antenna at home and have internet access through us. We have internet connection via the Croatian Academic Network we are collaborating with in the wireless project. Together with CARNet we set up a number of antennas in the city and of course on the top of Rojc. If somebody likes, we can install it, if we have time, of course. At our Hacklab took place the international hacker meeting in 2004 (Trans Hack Meeting – www.transhackmeeting.org), bringing together about 300 hackers from whole Europe. The ideas of the meeting were autonomy and do it yourself (DIY). Everybody cooked and cleaned, had all rights and duties and all decisions were made in consensus. The participants were mainly programmers and experts and all of them could earn a heap of euros monthly somewhere, but they preferred to give their knowledge to the community by creating software that is free and gratis and to build up hacklabs in Europe that offer free access to the internet. This is how we imagine our Hacklab and what we offer there. There is the possibility that people set up computer or we do it. We collect old computers that people throw away

but that are still very useful. People who have too much money constantly exchange old things and buy new computers. In addition we offer web space, email, mailing lists etc for initiatives that are useful for the community.

There was an tragic incident in 2004, when two young people left the Rojc at 4 in the night. They were heavily attacked by a group of nazi skinheads. Until then, police in Pula said that there don't exist any nazi skinheads or similar groups. We asked if they had to have proofs for a nazi movement to consider them as an organized group. After this we succeeded to organize together with the other organisations from Rojc a protest with some thousand people taking part. We were astonished that so many people came, because Pula is a small city. After that, this group of nazi skinheads was charged with attempted murder and the main perpetrator was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment.

In 2004 we organised the EYFA Wintermeeting together with the European Youth for Action (EYFA) from Amsterdam, which organises for example Ecotopia and Bike Tour cross Europe. We offer our space to different initiatives or whoever asks for a room to organise meetings. All these years we have had quite "important" and interesting guests at Hacklab, for example this year came Richard Stallman. There were also John Zerzan and various collectives. For we celebrate 15 years of existence in 2007, we thought to make a bigger festival to bring together various people that in a way mark these 15 years, but the organisation we gave over to the young activists and we will see how it will be in the end. Currently, our most interesting project is the Monteparadiso Netlabel that distributes music completely free and gratis and bands from Pula and elsewhere can publish their music absolutely free.

- 1 Now the building is owned exclusively be the city.
- 2 Now the number raised to 107 organisations.

Links:

<http://twiki.monteparadiso.hr>

<http://netlabel.monteparadiso.org>

<http://fazan.org>

<http://twiki.pula.org>

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning activism and anarchism in the frame of the Talks on Anarchism, held on 17th October 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers Edgar Buršić i Igor Todorović.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Critical Media in Germany

Boris Kanzleiter

My subject is critical media in Germany. Why is this interesting for tonight's discussion in Dom Omladine in Belgrade? I would say, for several reasons: Germany has a relatively great experience in the production of alternative, non-commercial and critical media of every kind. Despite that, the radical left does not have a great influence on political discourse. Therefore, the left is in a position that we could call "a political ghetto". In this context, the left in Germany and the left in Serbia have something in common.

What is the function of critical media? What motivations spur media activism? We can consider three different aspects:

- The need to do something against the manipulation and lies of commercial or state-owned media – this concept could be described as the "counter-information" concept.
- The second is that we want to establish media which are in our hands, to make independent decisions on what we want to film or write about, and how we want to do it, and not to depend on the policy of a publishing house or on commercial pressures. We consider that media are not a commodity on the market, but a means for our creative desires.
- Third aspect is that we wish to use media to change the world. This might sound a bit pathetic, but, in essence, this way the media is perceived as a means of political activism.

I would say that critical media in Germany are rather successful with respect to "counter-information". I doubt that here are many countries where a person can read so many well-researched subjects and information about various problems. There are at least ten anti-fascist magazines in Germany which publish information about neo-Nazi movement which is becoming increasingly strong. You can find all kinds of information about the activities of the radical right, about their numerous organizations, where attacks were carried out on immigrants, left-wingers, Jews, or homosexuals, what is the nature of the ideologies of such organizations, etc. (<http://www.antifaschistische-nachrichten.de/index.shtml>). Next examples are various magazines and Internet web-sites on social unrest in Germany and around the world. There you can find information about strikes and campaigns against multi-national compa-

nies (<http://www.labournet.de/>). We could list a number of similar examples, critical information on ecology, anti-racial movements, and political struggle in South America (<http://www.lateinamerikanachrichten.de/>). Some media have a wider selection of topics. For example, the Jungle World, where I work, is a weekly. It publishes articles and stories on politics in Germany and in the world, culture and theory (<http://www.jungle-world.com>).

All these media projects were formed because the activists working in movements against neo-Nazi groups, against pollution, etc. considered that it was necessary to spread independent information. Ordinary commercial media inform either wrongly or do not inform at all about stated problems, and are often counter-productive or negative; for example, when spreading racism. However, the main problem of the “counter-information” concept is that it is not enough to spread independent and critical information, it is necessary to actually change something in the society. It is the exact opposite: the best information does not mean that something is changing, because the information itself is not decisive in the political decision-making, it is the socio-political power and interest which are decisive.

There is a big general problem: we live in (neo) capitalist societies and information is generally a commodity that is sold and purchased. Commercial media inform us not make us understand something better, but because their intention is to sell their media. Consumers of such media are not mere victims of disinformation and manipulation; they look for a piece of spectacle and pseudo-entertainment in capitalism. Adorno and Debord are some of the critical intellectuals who have written well on this subject in the past century. Naturally, critical information can be a part of that media spectacle. I would like to give one recent example: shocking photographs of German soldiers from Afghanistan appeared several weeks ago. Soldiers were playing with a skeleton found in one of the massive graves. The scene was rather dismal. What did German media do on this issue? They showed the pictures of soldiers on the first pages of all news. The shock was immense. The Bild sold many more copies than usual. Generals and politicians found themselves in an awkward situation. However, no one can say that there was pressure not to publish the pictures. There was no censorship. On the other hand, there is the question of the interpretation of those pictures. The Bild and a certain politician spread the fear that Islamic fundamentalists could carry out attacks in Germany. That increased the sale of the Bild even further. Certain generals said that German soldiers must not do anything of the kind because it tarnishes the honor of the German army. The statement seems ridiculous if you are familiar with the history of the German army. The problem is that none of the commercial media made critical comments on the essence of the problem, which is that German soldiers in Afghanistan are a part of a dirty

war. Therefore, the problem is not just information, but the interpretation as well. In that context, it is an illusion that something can be changed just with successful counter-information. Despite that, I see the purpose in the work and existence of the critical media because they can open a space for the action of critical social movements. In that sense, the work of anti-fascist magazines is very useful. A pre-condition for action is information and communication between activists and that is the role of the independent media. Another important role of the critical media for activism is a discussion among left-wingers. During past years, there were several significant debates in Germany's critical media. Discussed issues involved anti-Semitism among the left, Stalinism and the experience of the so-called real-socialist regimes, the role of new social elements such as immigrants, etc. Some say that such theoretical debates do not change anything. I think that is wrong. Debates are a proof that critical opinions exist and that they are developing. True, it is necessary to interpret the world in order to change it successfully.

I would like to shortly address the issue of financial problems regarding the work in media. Independent media are independent if they are self-financed, and financing represents a great problem. This problem needs to be solved. The *Jungle World* is always on the brink of financial collapse. Weekly newspapers can not be made without professional editors, and salaries are extremely low. Practically, the only source of financing for the *Jungle World* is the sale of newspapers. We also organize concerts occasionally. This is the way almost all critical media in Germany operate and they usually do not pay their journalists and editors. Distribution is also a problem. The *Jungle World* can be bought only at a specific number of news-stands and it is not sold in a great number of copies. This is the reason why the newspapers are mostly distributed by mail. In Germany, the number of small bookshops or info-shops, where critical books, newspapers or magazines are sold, is ever decreasing. Due to financial problems, the Internet has become a very important space for critical media activism during last few years...

Boris Kanzleiter is journalist, media activist and historian, lives in Belgrade and Berlin.

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning media and anarchism in the frame of the Discussions on Anarchism, held on 17th November 2006 at the Dom Omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers: Boris Kanzleiter, Violeta Anđelković i Pop.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Introduction in 19th-century Anarchism in Russia

Misha Mashina

Good evening, so I am introduced as postanarchist and it may sound strange that I am moderating the story about anarchism and marxism, the story that sounds modern, not postmodern, but nevermind that – after short introduction I am giving a word to our guest.

I will just pose some questions that are probably going to be presented and analyzed during this story. Well I would get back to XIX century and the end of 1870's in Russia, Russia that still was not burdened by the question of marxism, but nevertheless was in revolutionary situation. Through an anecdote I will try to present you a problematic that is going to be worked out this evening.

Imagine the Russia in which military service lasted for 25 years until the mid-XIX century, and later a bit less. In which soldiers and officers certainly presented the population in which you need to propagate revolutionary ideas. So at the end of 1870's during already populist movement (народники) and developed nihilist revolutionary movement, at one moment a group of soldiers in the barracks reads illegal literature. It is the literature of one small group of ex-bakuninists and now pretty much redefined – in any case something that was called populist current. So the soldiers are reading the literature of Black Repartition (Черный передел – the repartition of the land) – revolutionary group from Russia from which later Plekhanov emerged, one of the first marxists in Russia. They're reading that literature and suddenly officer bumps in their barracks. Of course, punishments in Russia for reading the illegal literature were from sending to Siberia, even to hanging. And so the officer comes in and the soldiers are trying to hide that illegal material under the desk, but officer notices that, takes the brochure with a look of: what's this? Soldiers are scared, they think of the worst punishment, but the officer comes after several days with some other illegal brochure and says: Well, we officers read this! It was a paper published by the group called People's Will (Народная воля – 'воля' is both a freedom and a will), the other variant of populist revolutionaries. It was about two groups: Black Repartition that agitated within the soldiers and lower officers, and People's Will that agitated in the wider circles, and which at this point went to officers.

It occurred that both the soldiers and the officers in this barracks read the

same revolutionary literature, from two different sources. Officers said: We're fighting for the same cause maybe by different means. It was about two groups that emerged from the same organization – Land and Freedom (Земля и воля) which dismantled during the 70's of the XIX century exactly because of the question that will later on become interesting for the clash between marxism and anarchism, and which in fact already existed on the West but in Russian condition it has been just posed. Smaller group agitated within the soldiers, advocated for the self-organization, autonomy of the sections, circles etc., with the idea of mass peasants' and workers' revolution that would be initiated by the peasants and workers themselves, without intrusion from professional revolutionaries, special avangarde etc. In contrast to that, People's Will advocated some kind of blankist coup d'état and revolution, it wanted to form revolutionary organization strong enough to shake Russian absolutism, take the power and with the full support from the peasantry and the still small-numbered workers make social reforms and lead to the situation in which people could continue the rule without Tsar and capitalism.

But there was a big question, in Russia formulated differently then, but already present in the West of the Europe, the relation of economical and political struggle. This small group at the dawn of bakuninism and such anarchist current in Russia, that advocated the primacy of economical struggle – which in Russian conditions meant the liberation of serfs, redistribution of the land and national wealth and the destruction of the state, because the main goal of populists of that time was anarchy and collectivism, which is explicitly stated in various documents. In contrast to them, already rising, Russian blankists and jacobins advocated the primacy of the political struggle, of the taking of power, organizing from the top to the bottom with the decrees of the government and with assumed full support from the people. We already have there, when Bakunin wasn't so much in this but more in the happenings on the West in the struggle of his Alliance and the International Workingmen's Association, we have clearly posed the question of economical and political struggle, what has a primacy, what leads to so called 'real' revolution, 'real' reform. Two groups, two currents in the Russian populist movement were the parallel of what was happening in the West. I will now give a word to professor Dragutin Leković, with a question how the anarchism and marxism developed around that question earlier and later, in the Western Europe and Russia, and how did we come to today's condition.

This text is part of the transcript of a discussion concerning marxism and anarchism in the frame of the Discussions on Anarchism, held on 7th of December 2006 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with the speakers: Misha Mashina and Dragutin Leković. Professor Dragutin Leković is a marxist theoretician. He was born 1919, lives and works in Belgrade and Podgorica.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Strategies of political struggle, violence and non-violence

Silke Maier-Witt, Dragan Ambrozić

Dragan Ambrozić: Could you tell us something about the political situation in Germany in the seventies that led you to the field of political activism? How did you get involved?

Silke Maier-Witt: It is always difficult to explain especially to young people the feeling of the time when we started our political engagement or whatever you might call it. When I started studying around 68/69, the students' movement reached its culminating point. We went against old structures within the university, the Vietnam war was waged and we fought against imperialism. At that time we thought that we could change everything. I belong to the post war generation in Germany, my father was a member of the SS. I learned very late at school what really happened during the Second World War and which role Germany played in it. I tried to find out, why my father and my parent's generation didn't do anything substantial against fascism. I was convinced that I would have done something. I asked my father: What did you do when you became to know that 6 million Jews were killed? His reaction was: Who told you that? It was denied and not talked about. That gave me the impression that I had to do something to make sure that things like that would never happen again. And consequently I took part in several political movements trying to find out where is my place, where can I engage myself. At that time we had an organization called "red help" and tried to take part in the political trials that were going on at that time.

During the demonstrations against the Shah of Persia and the Vietnam war in Berlin one student was killed¹ and after his death discussions started about whether violence is justified or not. I was fascinated by the already existing Red Army Fraction, because they were consequently going their way. In 1974, the imprisoned RAF members were on hunger strike. Holger Meins died in hunger strike when I just came back from holidays in Yugoslavia and Greece. I had a bad conscience, because he had fought for a change with his whole life, while I had been enjoying myself in the sun. At that time all left wing groups in Hamburg, where I was studying, met to discuss actions for his burial in

Hamburg. At that occasion I became a member of the committee against torture that was formed all over Germany, because the treatment of the RAF prisoners at that time really was a kind of new torture. I joined this group and we were trying to make public events to support the prisoners. I worked in a lawyer's office that supported the imprisoned RAF people, got closer and closer to the people in the surrounding of the RAF prisoners and lost contact to other people more and more.

I lived together with people that occupied the German embassy in Stockholm². That was the first time that somebody out of my closer surrounding did something like that. Police arrested all of us, raided our apartment and so all of a sudden I was on the other side. But at that time I still thought that I could never do something like that. I would have liked to be more courageous, to be more in the center of the happenings, and when I learned that some people tried to organize something illegally I was very proud when they asked me to support them. The more I came into contact with people supporting the RAF, the more I lost contact with other groups and it was easier to be told what to do, to enter this group and to be on the right side. It was not a decision: now I'm going that way, but it happened gradually.

I still remember the first time I met the ones who then formed the Red Army Fraction. The leading persons Baader, Meinhof and Ensslin were already in jail, I worked in the office of one of their lawyers in Stuttgart and they told us what we should do. Of course we were very conscious that we were not really fighting, we were only supporting. Whenever they told us to do something, we did it. So the first thing I did, was to check borders and possible targets for actions. In Brussels I was supposed to check out how secure is the European parliament building, how you would get in and so on. In April 1977 they planned some kind of action, where we might be caught to and they asked me to join the group on the very day when they shot chief federal prosecutor Siegfried Buback. I agreed. That was my way into the RAF.

It was only later that I reflected on why I became part of that group. It was not out of strength that I went, it was more like entering into a group that took part of the responsibility from me. I was handed over a big pistol I was running around with in my trousers the whole day and I did not even spend one thought about it, it did not occur to me to think about what I am going to do with this gun. Somebody told me to take it and I did, and this is what I regretted later on, because it is a way of handing over responsibility to somebody else.

Dragan Ambrozić: How was the dynamic of the group? Did you have contracts, did you have hierarchies? What was the human touch of the group, how functioned the internal human relations?

Silke Maier-Witt: In theory, you would find humanity of revolutionary action, but in practice it was not like this. We had a hierarchy of people that were leading and others who were not so leading. In the beginning, I was in the Netherlands in an illegal apartment and my task was mainly to rent cars, to transport some weapons, to falsify passports, it was not so exiting. After the shooting of Ponto, my picture was on television and posters all over and that made it a bit difficult to move around. Seen from now, I wonder how I managed to live like that all the time. There was this constant danger of being recognized, of being arrested, but I somehow managed to subdue my emotions. It was like being cold and cool enough to do it and not to show any signs of distress. I tried to function and to figure out what the other members of the group wanted me to do, how I should behave. It was not that I felt comfortable. I was proud when the group decided that I should go to Germany, because they were already preparing a bigger action to liberate the prisoners from Stammheim. The action being prepared was the kidnapping of Schleyer³.

Dragan Ambrozić: What is the relation between your ideological views at that time and your emotions? Did you start to question yourself?

Silke Maier-Witt: No I did not. I was member of a group doing things I found legitimate. I did not question the legitimacy of killing people. Kidnapping Schleyer for instance meant to kill four people, that is his driver and the policemen guarding him and when I see the pictures, I still feel that horror. It was an action with a lot of shooting and killing. But at the same time the whole machinery of searching for us started and there was not much time to let this come closer to your heart. You had to function somehow and I did not question anything. If I had started questioning, the group would not have functioned anymore.

When I was still in jail, I was asked by young school girls: How could you join a group of which you knew that they were killing people? This is really a question, the answer is not easy to find for. I could say of course what were my ideological reasons. According to the ideology of the Red Army Fraction you could only fight imperialism in the head of the monster itself, but that was so academic. We were not really fighting for a positive aim, we fought against something, but there wasn't anything positive we tried to reach. At that time the aim of the group was confined to getting out the prisoners. They would tell us what to do, how to go on.

Dragan Ambrozić: What was the emotional truth behind these actions for you? Why did you feel that you have the right to do that?

Silke Maier-Witt: I tried to tell you that we did not really question this. When

Schleyer was dead we thought about what to do next to have maximum effect and somebody had the idea of raiding American barracks and killing as many people as possible. I thought, well, this would be a blood bath and at the moment I voiced some resentment or doubt about if I would be able to do that, I was no longer considered to be on the right track. You could not really question what was happening.

Dragan Ambrozić: So actually there was no discussion inside of the group?

Silke Maier-Witt: There was very little space for discussion, particularly after the kidnapping of Schleyer. We were only two members left in Germany, the rest was in Paris and elsewhere. There was no space and no openness, especially when the leading people from the Red Army Fraction committed suicide in Stammheim we were somehow headless. We went to Jemen to get some kind of training with Palestinians and at that time it occurred to me that we didn't have a real aim. Being confronted with young Palestinians, you could see that they were fighting for their people, but our actions were quite abstract, not concrete. What was the alternative we were fighting for? After the kidnapping of Schleyer we had lost almost all support within Germany, because we could hardly move in Germany, we could not contact legal persons and young people and we could not communicate what we were fighting for. In the late seventies, for me it was already the end of the movement. Some wanted to leave, some were ill and a lot of people were arrested, a lot had died. But at that time we did not yet realize that it was already over.

Dragan Ambrozić: How did it happen that you left the group and how was this perceived by the group?

Silke Maier-Witt: When we were in Jemen, it was already clear that the group was falling apart. One member of the group was drug addict, but he pretended to be mortally ill and the whole group was busy to get drugs for him. The then leading decided to transport him to a hospital in Lebanon. At that time the leading persons of our group were arrested in Yugoslavia. So we were again headless. Brigitte Mohnhaupt was arrested, as well Sieglinde Hofmann and some more people. They were in Belgrade in prison, but later released. It was in 78. We all met in the camp in Jemen and there then was a kind of discussion, how to go on. There was critique and self critique and lots of doubts, whether we could go on at all. I would have stayed at that camp if I had had the possibility. But we all moved back to Germany and at a certain point we needed money. Living illegally is very expensive and it was decided to prepare a bank robbery. So I was told to go to Switzerland to rent several apartments,

and to check out which bank to rob. During this bank robbery a woman was killed, she was not connected to the bank, she was not a member of the group, she was just there accidentally. Waiting for the others to return I heard over the radio that this woman was killed and one of our members was arrested. When the group came back, the first thing I said was: This woman was killed. This was enough for them to realize that it was more important for me that this woman was killed than the fact that one of us was arrested. So that was it. Without many words it was clear: now we go back to Paris, we cross the border and after that it is over. What I didn't know then was that I was not the only one who left or was thrown out of the group at that time, but it were ten people.

Dragan Ambrozić: This is a breaking point for you. What did you do, where did you go?

Silke Maier-Witt: The group of course considered us to be a risk. We prepared ourselves to go to Angola or Mozambique and started learning Portuguese and tried to figure out what we could do, still wanting to do something for third world people. But then the group decided that all of us should go to Prague, so with false passports and on different roads all of us went to Prague, first to Vienna to get a visa for Prague, and there we stayed for some time. After some weeks we were told that we would go to GDR. That came a bit like a surprise because nobody of us would have expected that they would even take us. To make it short I stayed ten years in the former GDR and after the fall of the Berlin wall I was arrested and sent to jail for five years.

Dragan Ambrozić: During all that time in the group, was there any kind of political debate going on?

Silke Maier-Witt: I have to admit that there was very little political debate, it was more like going from action to action. The less money we had, the more difficult it was to rent apartments, the police developed better methods and it was easier for them to detect us. The more difficult it became, the less time we had to think it over. The only political aim we had was the continuation of the politics to attack the United States in Germany and to make clear that Germany is a province of the United States. When Schleyer was kidnapped, he was questioned by members of the group and this was recorded. I had the task to write down what was recorded and even at that time I was amazed how blue eyed the questions were, it was a blue eyed picture of capitalism, there weren't any substantial questions. I have to say, there was not much politics.

Dragan Ambrozić: How was your experience being out of the group and

trying to continue normal life in Eastern Germany?

Silke Maier-Witt: For quite some time it was not a normal life. The first reaction being sort of thrown out of the group was the intense feeling that I was not good enough, that I am not a revolutionary. It was like falling into a deep hole. I couldn't see how to live on, because we were still wanted by the police and we couldn't move freely. In the GDR I had another name, another story and the Stasi⁴ people were the only ones we could talk to, because they knew who we were. They told us, our task was not to be noted and that was difficult.

Dragan Ambrozić: What were your feelings seeing the Berlin wall falling down?

Silke Maier-Witt: All of a sudden I had new ideas and I got a feeling of things are moving again, although at the same time I knew that the closer the two parts came together the more risky it was for us to get arrested. I was actively engaged in the women's movement after the fall of the wall, but I knew that we would be arrested.

Dragan Ambrozić: What did the policemen ask you, when they came to arrest you?

Silke Maier-Witt: Not much. I was working at that time at a pharmaceutical factory, they arrested me and were proud to have caught somebody like me. For me it was the first time that I was myself again, with my name and my history, because the time before I had always pretended to be somebody else.

Dragan Ambrozić: What was your emotional reaction in that moment, when you had to recapitulate and to think everything over?

Silke Maier-Witt: It was only in jail that I started to put back the pieces and to think about why I was a member of the RAF. It was a way of coping with it to be able to talk about it and to be able to be myself again. And it took quite some time to kind of go all over what happened, to figure out what happened with me, how could it happen that I kind of turned off my brain and my emotions and functioned the way I did. One of the things I found out is, that violence changes people too and that you can't really change things by speeding them up and using violence. In fact you do the same what you are accusing the others of.

Dragan Ambrozić: Since 1999 you are personally involved and active in

easing down the psychological traumas that war brings.

Silke Maier-Witt: I was arrested in 1990 and sentenced to ten years in prison. In 1995, after half of the time, I was released, finished my studies of psychology and thought I could live a normal life. But I was confronted with the reactions of people that were either afraid of me or thought that I was some kind of a hero. I couldn't get any job and I was very frustrated not to find anything I could do. Even when I tried to work voluntarily, people on the higher levels were afraid to hire me. It was after the bombing of Serbia, when there were all these discussions going on in Germany, what could be done instead of bombing, when I felt the need to involve myself politically again. I didn't know exactly in which way, but then I read the announcement in the papers that "forum for civil peace service" was looking for a peace expert. The idea to find out ways of preserving peace or working for peace by other means than violence I found very very challenging. And that's when I decided to engage myself in proving that there are other possibilities. When I decided to do that, the German government was skeptic, because they were afraid of the headline: German government supports ex-terrorist and people could not believe that I changed so much. I knew, for me this was a chance to get out, to do something and to actively find my place in society again. And forum took me because of my history and that I appreciated very much. So I was convinced that I found the right thing to do. In February 2000 I finally arrived in Kosovo. I stayed there until the end of last year and am now in Skopje. That's my life in short.

Public: You mentioned in the beginning that your father was in the SS. Here in Ex-Yugoslavia we had a lot of bloodshed and most people didn't do anything actively to prevent all this. Like in Germany, people are always - Enzensberger wrote about this in his book - a mass going behind some leaders, a government. Especially in Germany in the Second World War, everything was very well organized, think of the Holocaust, because Germans are sort of hard working and well organized. How it comes that nobody fell out of the system?

Silke Maier-Witt: Because of my own engagement in the RAF, where I successfully managed to switch off my brain and my emotions, I feel that this happened to people in Germany during Nazism. If you have some kind of ideology that tells you that you are on the right track, it is always easier to commit all kinds of horrible things. This is what ideologies are for. When I was young, I was accusing my father of not having done anything and it was only later that I saw that he spent all his youth in some army-like surrounding. He wasn't free enough to really take responsibility himself. I still don't

know what he really did. From there I understand that it is easy to manipulate people and I was like that too, in a way. It was a lack of self-confidence and a lack of taking responsibility for my own actions that led me to join the group. It's like joining a sect, you don't have to think every day of what is good and what is bad. The decision is taken and then you are member of a group and are not personally responsible. But you are in the end.

I would like to add, that at that time, the generation of my parents never really talked about what they did, about their experience. It would have been helpful for us, the next generation, to hear, how they experienced war and how difficult it was, not to be part of the Nazi party and to have an independent way of thinking. It would have been easier for all of us, if they had at least regretted what happened. But everybody was silent about it. I think that makes it even worse. There is some kind of connection, somebody told me, when Schleyer was shot, he was shot from the back into the head. We ended on the same level our fathers had been too. Terrorism had come back in a way.

Public: I would ask you to deepen the analogy that you are trying to make here, because I am not really sure how you can say that killing of innocent people by the Nazis is the same as killing a person that is the head of a company inside of the capitalist machinery, which kills people. The second question is: You said you met two types of people: The ones that were afraid of you and the ones that saw you as a hero. Did you meet somebody who thinks that your behavior now is something like a treason?

Silke Maier-Witt: Yes of course. But first of all I think killing is killing. Usually I quote Gandhi saying that sometimes doing nothing is worse than doing the wrong thing. And that is where you might be able to justify killing like a reflex of saving a family or your country from an invader or something like that. But I would not say that there is no link with the organized killing of people during Nazi time. It's the same kind of mechanism that makes you able to do this, because it is giving you the official permission to do something that you should not do. And that is not justified. For what kind of vague ideas RAF decided to kill people, to wipe out a life telling you have the right to do so. Who gives you the right to do so? And what would we change, on the positive side, what would we like to reach? How to change something that you consider to be bad, as imperialism that is killing people, by killing? By doing the same? This is a contradiction you cannot come away from. And people who are doing the killing, they change. Nobody can take the personal responsibility from them that they have killed. This is my opinion on that. Of course you can not avoid being called a traitor if there is still a group of people sticking to the ideology they built up.

Public: Did you have contact with other groups?

Silke Maier-Witt: Yes. When I was member of the committee against torture for example, we went to Ireland and had contact with the IRA. But we found out that all of them had a different strategy, they were far more connected and they had a broader basis, especially the Red Brigades. We were not the only ones at that time, but I think every country had a specific group in keeping with its history.

Public: Do you have a special methodology in your work in Skopje nowadays, dealing with traumas of war?

Silke Maier-Witt: Maybe I have less problems to see that people can change, because of my own experience, and I'm less afraid to talk with people who still use violence. I have no problem to talk with them and to figure out what could be done. Anyhow, I think peace work could be more effective, if you could find ways to work with those people, who actually still use violence. I always would have liked to do a project with Ex-UČK members, because they would be the ones who might start again, if they are traumatized or frustrated or whatever. I think my own experience of how I got into the group is similar to the example of other people who somehow came into the army and found themselves doing things they thought they would never be able to do. I think you are neither good nor bad, you are in between, you move from one side to the other. But you have to take responsibility for your actions and to be able to decide everyday anew, which side you would like to be on and to think of ways not to follow like a sheep what other people tell you.

Public: You worked in Kosovo with Albanian and Serbian women together in one group. What is your experience?

Silke Maier-Witt: In the end of last year I mainly worked with Serbian and Albanian women in the region of Strpce. There are even mixed villages and we had a very challenging dialog, when we worked with thirty women, fifteen Serbian and fifteen Albanian. We did a time line to find out what was important in the latest history for the Serbian side and for the Albanian side. They could ask each other, how they look at things. The Serbian women for example asked the Albanian women: Why did you destroy our houses coming back from Albania? And the Albanian women asked: Why did you support Milošević so long? There were a lot of emotions attached to that, because of course everybody had bad experiences and it was not easy to listen to the other one talking about things you would not like to hear. But the amazing thing was that after ten sessions like that, we all went out on a boat trip, we

all went out dancing together, so it was possible to overcome this and to find a way of communicating and to be together.

And we had as well very good sessions together with Women in Black from Belgrade. There is the possibility to overcome all these differences, if you have a common aim and women of course could find a lot of common problems, they would have to solve together. It's not easy but I had really challenging experiences.

Public: You said to murder is to murder, every murder is equally bad. Do you mean that if a Nazi in the Second World War is killing a Jew it is equally bad as if a Partisan kills a Nazi? My second question is: Do you think that there was a problem with the particular group you were in, because the RAF wasn't connected to any mass movement?

Silke Maier-Witt: It's difficult. If you take for example Vietnam, all of us would have agreed at that time that the Vietnamese people had all the right to fight against the invasion. But if you look at it in the end, what came out of it was a lot of suffering for the people and what we thought would be a victory, was not really a victory. The same happened in Nicaragua for instance. Who decides if you are a terrorist or a freedom fighter? It's the success in the end that makes it. Moreover, and that is always true with these movements, it is very difficult to come back to a normal state, because murdering changes people, nobody is unaffected by it. If you do it, you have problems coming back to a normal life again. I think you cannot justify what you are doing with a higher aim. The danger is that you find always excuses for what you are doing, you blame the others.

In Germany there was an exhibition about the atrocities done by the soldiers of the Wehrmacht⁵ during the Second World War in Poland. What I found most disturbing is, that there is a kind of distinction made between an accepted way of killing and a not accepted way of killing. Which seems to me very sophisticated, because the regular killing is accepted and the irregular killing is sanctioned. But the people who killed, even if they are regular soldiers, stay not unaffected by it, they suffer and they take something into society that changes the whole society. I think this is true in every war that is being waged.

Public: I come from gender studies in Belgrade and I'm interested in the role of women in politics and especially in the role of women in radical politics. In your experience, how could you explain the fact that women are much less present in politics in general but were present in large numbers in radical groups in Germany and in other countries? Did you find that the attitude of women within your group towards violence was different from

the attitude of men towards violence?

Silke Maier-Witt: It is in fact remarkable that in the RAF there were quite a lot of women. I don't really have a good explanation for it. It might be that it's an overcompensation of showing that we are really equal. We would have to talk longer about that, it's a question I'm interested in as well.

Public: What is your personal perspective on this? Did you have personal conflicts about using violence as a woman?

Silke Maier-Witt: I started in the womens' movement, we were five women living together. I wanted to prove that I can live independently. At that time this was something very new, we tried hard to prove that we can do the same as male fighters do. So I think that this played a role in my decisions, because normally I was not such a courageous woman. I was very early convinced that I would not like to live as my mother did.

Public: Did that make you more radical in the sense that you fought against the life that your mother lived?

Silke Maier-Witt: Yes.

Public: Do you think that this made the other women more radical as well? Were women more radical than men? Or are they braver? Or is this a misconception?

Silke Maier-Witt: It can happen that they are even pushing men to be more radical. I think the role of women in war or violence should not be underestimated, because they are not better than men per se by being female, they even push men to be more radical, this is my experience, too. But I have to think about this a little bit more.

Dragan Ambrozić: In the end one very personal question: Did you finally find your peace in heart?

Silke Maier-Witt: In a way, yes. In found my peace with my own history. Because I cannot change it, I have to live with it and I have to make the best out of it and that is why I am here now.

Since 2000 Silke lives in ex-YU, first in Prizren, Kosovo, today in Skoplje, Macedonia and works as peace consultant for Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst on various projects.

Dragan Ambrozić is independent writer and program manager of the Cultural Center DOB in Belgrade.

This text is a transcript of a talk concerning “Strategies of political struggle, violence and non-violence”, held on 9th of May 2007 at the Dom omladine (Cultural Center DOB) in Belgrade, with Dragan Ambrozić and guest Silke Maier-Witt.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Serbia license

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.sr_LATN

(1) In June 1967 Benno Ohnesorg was shot by a policeman.

(2) In April 1975 Commando “Holger Meins” occupied the Western German embassy in Stockholm to liberate the RAF-prisoners

(3) Hans-Martin Schleyer, president of the Federal Association of German Industries and president of the Federal Employers Association, was kidnapped in Cologne in September 1977 by the RAF.

(4) Secret police of East Germany

(5) Armed forces of Germany from 1935 to 1945

Horizontalidad, Autonomy and New Subjectivity in Argentina: What makes something Anarchist?

Marina Sitrin

Millions of people singing, “they all must go! not even one should remain!”, Public art reading: Neither God or Nation, Self management, Our Dreams do not fit in your ballot boxes, The True Democracy is in the Streets, and Occupy, Resist, Produce. Hundreds of thousands of middle class, and recently declassed urban dwellers organizing in neighbourhood assemblies, rejecting hierarchy and instead using forms of direct democracy and horizontalidad, hundreds of work places, from clinics and supermarkets, to print shops and daily newspapers being taken over and run by the workers, again, using forms of direct democracy and horizontalidad. Indigenous communities retaking their land, and doing so with the support and solidarity of people in other movements. Unemployed workers not only shutting down roads and bridges to demand unemployment subsidies (which were won), but also self-organizing in their neighbourhoods, creating communal bakeries and kitchens, popular education and schools, alternative medicine, sometimes including optometry and acupuncture, taking over land to create organic gardens to feed the community, building housing on the occupied land, creating fish hatcheries and raising other livestock for protein. In some cases creating beauty paroles and cinemas. And then, many of these movements, relating to one another as a movement of movements. Movements that are not trying to take state power, but are creating the alternatives they want to see now, in their day to day relationships.

This is just a glimpse of the inspiring creation that has been taking place in Argentina, particularly since the 19th and 20th of December of 2001, when a total economic collapse precipitated millions of people taking to the streets, cacerolando (banging pots and pans), and within two weeks expelling five consecutive governments, while simultaneously creating horizontal assemblies, involving hundreds of thousands across the country, to try and meet their basic necessities and creating new social relationships in the process.

Throughout history people have and continue to look to one another when formal institutions are laid bare. This does not always happen, but often, when left alone, people look to one another and begin to work together to reorganize and reshape their lives and communities. This is usually done in a way that is more loving and mutually respectful than relationships in the previous situation. This break, this change in how things are usually seen, and how we are taught to behave, can shift people's imaginations and ways of being so that we begin to organize differently. The experience in Argentina shows this. It is not the economic crisis that produced a change, but it was a long moment in which people began a process of rupture where they began to see one another differently, to see themselves differently, and began creating a new society based in these new imaginations.

Over the past ten years the world has been witnessing an upsurge in prefigurative revolutionary movements; movements that is that create the future in the present. These new movements are not creating party platforms or programs. They do not look to one leader, but make space for all to be leaders, redefining ideas of leadership through practice. They place more importance on asking the right questions than on providing the correct answers. They resolutely reject dogma and hierarchy in favour of direct democracy and consensus. They are movements striving to base themselves in trust and love.

The autonomous social movements in Argentina are only one part of these many movements. Within Argentina the movement is also a movement of movements. All of these active movements are now relating to one another, and thus constructing new types of networks that reject the hierarchical template bequeathed to them by established politics. A part of this rejection includes a break with concept of "power-over," people are attempting to organize on a flatter plane, with the goal of creating "power-with," one another. Embedded in these efforts is a commitment to value both the individual and the collective. Simultaneously, separately, and together these groups are organizing in the direction of a more meaningful and deeper freedom, using the tools of direct democracy and direct action. Together, I believe, they are constructing a new sort of popular power.

Horizontalidad is a word that has come to embody the new social arrangements and principles of organization of these movements in Argentina. As its name suggests, it implies a flat plane upon which to communicate. It entails the use of direct democracy and involves, or at least intentionally strives towards, non-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian creation rather than reaction. It is a break with vertical ways of organizing and relating. Horizontalidad is a

living word, reflecting an ever-changing experience. Months after the popular rebellion, many movement participants began to speak of their relationships as horizontal as a way of describing the new forms of decision-making. Years after the rebellion, those continuing to build new movements speak of horizontalidad as a goal as well as a tool.

The question then, especially for me, but one I know that many grapple with as well as debate and discuss, is if it is useful to place some of these new movements in a theoretical and historical framework so as to better understand them and add to our understandings of social change, whether as socialists, anarchists or autonomists. I do not think we should place any of the new movements in one particular framework. That said, I do think that certain concepts of anarchism or non-authoritarian socialism can help in understanding some of the practices and principles of these movements. These movements also lend examples and experiences to the anarchist tradition. I am not meaning to play with words or be ambiguous here. I do not think it is the role of an anarchist for example to tell other people they are anarchists, especially when they choose explicitly to not identify as such. The same is true of autonomists or socialists. What I do think however is that one can look at similarities, listen carefully to the new practices and articulations, and draw parallels so that each can learn from one another.

Marina Sitrin is a New York City-based lawyer, writer, and activist who has spent large portions of the past years in Argentina, working with, and studying the autonomous movements.

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Serbia license
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.sr_LATN

Notes on Post-Anarchism¹

Süreyya Evren

There is a postanarchist reduction of classical anarchism seen in texts of some key writers on post-anarchism (like Todd May, Saul Newman, Lewis Call or more recently Richard Day). Up until now, this feature of the postanarchist tendency has been criticized by various anarchists. But actually, ‘anarchists’ should admit that, ‘post-anarchists’ didn’t invent this! ‘Post-anarchists’ have been using the common anarchist history writing on classical anarchism which can be found anywhere in any reference book. The problem is, because of the reference to poststructuralism, they could be expected not to rely on that canonized history of anarchism without interrogating it, without questioning it at all.

When post-anarchists take the findings of a modernist, Eurocentric history writing of anarchism as a given truth and start working on this ground, it is likely to see them (post-anarchists) reproduce many problems already existing in this practice of history writing. (Jason Adams has given a basic critical questioning of this while he was talking on the “constructed history of anarchism”²). As someone working on post-anarchism as well, what Adams did in this early article was quite a good start – you have to turn your critical investigation to the given history of anarchism as well. Before comparing classical anarchism with poststructuralist philosophy, or before making a genealogy of affinity in the realm of ‘classical anarchism’ (that’s what Day does in “Gramsci is Dead”³) one must first endeavor to make a genealogy of the anarchist ‘canon’. These questions should be asked: how did the anarchist history writing developed? When and how were the main anarchist writers selected? Who were the fathers of the ‘fathers of anarchy’? Were there different tendencies in describing the main body of ‘classical anarchism’ and which tendency dominated the resulting history and how? How were the classical anarchists represented? Can we trace any hierarchy in these histories; were they modernist in their approach; can we trace any kind of discrimination?

Prejudice about a modernist anarchism is so strong that when these writers see an anti-modernist aspect of Bakunin for example, they either take it as an exception or something said inadvertently, or worse, as a contradiction! For example for Call, “Bakunin provides us, perhaps quite inadvertently, with a point of departure for postmodern anarchism.” Here, Bakunin says science

was marred by a dangerous and disturbing statism. So when Bakunin talks against science, he is talking “inadvertently”, but when he talks for science, that should be what he actually believes wholeheartedly. Why is that? Why then the ‘Bakunin effect’, the ‘Bakunin heritage’ is not the effect of a ‘science admirer’ but a creative man of deed and anarchist theory? How do we know if he said this inadvertently or not? Similarly, when Newman finds out that Kropotkin and Bakunin seemed anti-essentialist in some of their claims, he interprets these as ‘contradictions’! Whereas, the only contradiction is between the modernist image of anarchism and the real ‘anarchist effect’.

There is an assumption that both Marxism and anarchism are modernist political movements suffering the same modernist weaknesses, while anarchism has some potential to get out of this trap. Thus, to realize this we will have to eliminate modernist issues from classical anarchism (which is indeed the greater part of its political philosophy) and use remaining aspects that are in harmony with today’s post-modern/poststructuralist perspective.

Well, that was not really true, so let’s go back and start the discussion from there. Anarchism was not a modernist political movement, like Marxism, from the beginning it was an anti-modernist modern movement, and has been an important example of the modern radical movements. (‘Classical anarchism’ was not a Le Corbusierist movement but a Dadaist movement.) Modernist aspects in anarchism, on the contrary, are the minority, and ‘classical anarchism’ is mostly an anti-modernist current, there is little to eliminate in ‘classical anarchism’ and a lot to take if you are talking about a post-anarchism of today.

As it is with the history of anarchism, what I understand from post-anarchism has many folds, and one crucial fold is about anarchist history writing, a new post-anarchist thinking should bring a new anthology, a new history of anarchism. At least, a new sensibility towards existing anarchist histories.

Many accuse Newman or Day of ‘abusing’ anarchist tradition, as it is quite easy to recognize that their relation with the anarchist history is not sufficient on many levels – but on the other hand, what they are trying to do, especially Newman, is to bring anarchism into today’s political and theoretical agenda as something more powerful. This shouldn’t be underestimated. And I think they are trying the correct door for this – maybe they haven’t found the correct keys yet (maybe, it is time to make the keys collectively today).

* * *

When politicians see the anarchist embracing everything as political, struggling against every tiny possibility of domination, they regard this as an absence of something. Either a lack of passion for economics or a lack of passion for politics. What they don’t get is that everything is political with the anarchist and deserves the same passion. As the poet Ilhan Berk said in an

interview “everything is political, even water flows politically.” Even water flows politically – thus, anarchist politics is a politics of life, of culture, anarchism is a raven knocking on the window to invite you. A libertarian party has begun! Anarchists are de facto pan-anarchists. Anarchist politics lies in the multiplicity of non-politics. The core is not fixed.

* * *

Can it be true that some anarchist principles became generally accepted principles in some Western cultural environments? While discussing the post-Seattle anti-globalization movements, I always tried to ask: where did these protestors who want to organize in an anarchistic way come from? Are they products of anarchistic propaganda? Not likely. My assumption is Western societies (and also many world cities in different parts of the world) are today able to produce ‘anarchistic subjects’, subjects who would only be interested in politics if it is done according to ‘anarchist principles’ or a ‘logic of affinity’. This is because when these people wanted to get politicized there was no other way for them outside the anarchistic way – they wouldn’t accept being part of a Marxist party machine, wouldn’t accept orders, wouldn’t accept being represented by some revolutionary, and yet they still want to engage in something political – what is left for a person like that? Only anarchism or an unlabeled mode of organization which has anarchistic principles and which uses the logic of affinity. Another option is to get in touch with a Marxist faction which has openly declared that they will follow anarchistic principles (Holloway, Negri, etc.) that won’t frustrate ‘anarchistic subjects’ in the West. There may be something very fundamental for post-anarchism here. The question of “how did the postanarchist subjects appear” also goes back to May 68.

* * *

If we go back to the pre-1994 period of EZLN, we can remember that Marcos didn’t go to Chiapas for a post-revolution, he went there to organize a modernist-type revolution. Before 1994, EZLN happened through a process of mutuality in Chiapas. Not ended with an utopian heaven, but had a heavenly effect for the Left world. If we can lay aside political correctness for a moment, we can dare say that, although the Mexican government also had a paramilitary branch which killed and wounded many, there were very few countries that would let a Marcos be as he liked with his EZLN in 1994 and afterwards. For example it wouldn’t be possible in the USA, Peru, Russia, China, Turkey or UK. It wouldn’t happen in a ‘real democracy’ (which can’t endure strong oppositions as we recently witnessed when Western governments showed their brutal side to anti-globalisation protestors early in the 2000s in Gothenburg and in Italy) or in a ‘totalitarian country.’ Mexico was an exceptional zone. And from the beginning, in order not to let this exceptional state become

isolated and eventual fade away, EZLN/Marcos described it not as a form and not as an ideology, but as an understanding, as an approach to politics. Isn't this the core principle of 'new anarchism' today as well?

* * *

If we are bound to compare anyway, instead of comparing only Deleuze with Kropotkin, why don't we compare Emma Goldman with Helene Cixous and Irigaray. Voltairine de Cleyre with Butler and Flores Magon with Homi Bhabha. Why Russian anarchists in the anarchist canon are always Russian anarchists outside of Russia? Why is nobody taking serious anarchists in the Russian revolution – the worse decision of a Russian anarchist was not to leave Russia then, the best and only way to be known as a Russian anarchist was to leave Russia?! Let's go back to Avrich's 'The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution' and the inspiring "Pan-Anarchist Manifesto".

* * *

Call and Newman suggest that anarchism starts from its anti-state position. So for them, anarchism is first of all a political stance against all states, an anti-statism and everything comes after or from this. That's obviously not what many anarchists will understand by anarchism. We think that anarchism is pananarchism⁴ in nature, a rejection of all authority, hierarchy and representation. Being anti-state is a form of anti-hierarchy, anti-authoritarianism at the nation scale. On the other hand, anarchism carries politics outside the area of a fight for state power. It is always grassroots in this sense as well. You do not first reject the state. You first reject authority, hierarchy, pyramidal societies, representation and domination. Then, as such a person, when the issue comes to states, you of course also reject the state and think of something different like federations, etc.

And the reason that all these start from post-anarchism lies in the role of poststructuralist theories of philosophy and history in this intersectional web of resistance movements. Post-anarchism does not present a new anarchism to us. But it can create a resistance power against modernist categorizations of anarchist history and concepts. And moreover, it can be an embracement of poststructuralist philosophical contributions to the anarchist movement. Post-anarchism for me is just anarchism but stronger, joining forces with its relatives, network neighbours today and in history, in culture and in daily life. So this is an experiment in understanding anarchism (in its stronger post-anarchist form) as a world wide anti-modernist modern political movement which has existing or potential connections with other anti-modernist modern movements in different disciplines today and in history.

* * *

At one given time there are more than one centre of power, and if you want to resist them, you have to shape your resistance accordingly – which means, against many places of power, you need many places of resistance. In both approaches (understanding one central place of power or accepting that there are many centres) we anticipate that the resistance would mirror the structure of the supposed power. Is this a must? Usually yes, or usually the answer is yes. But we shouldn't forget that not always.

Here I should admit that this was a must for me for a long time and it was one of the reasons that led me to post-anarchism. For example in my first written account of “postmodernism and anarchism” in 1994, I basically said that if a libertarian left would emerge in Turkey it could only do that in the vast fields of postmodernism. Because representation has been generally collapsed after postmodernism. We are all in it with no way to escape, but we can choose what kind of a postmodernism we would apply, and this could be a anarcho-postmodernism. I was giving talks on “postmodernism and the left” and the main argument I was so confident about, was the same “don't you see the places of power are postmodernistic, so to neutralize them we have to mirror them from the other angle, which is anarcho-postmodernism”. Today I wouldn't find this so convincing, as I will try to show here, there is no ‘must’ in mirroring the actual power structures to overcome them. Understanding the structure of the places of power do not necessarily determine the structure of resistance against.

For example, you can accept that power is reducible, works with one decisive centre at one time, understand it as a pyramidal structure, but you can still fight this structure through anarchistic principles, using ‘tactical political philosophy’, or the logic of affinity. For example guerrilla struggles in many occasions deploy this, even Nechaev's cell structure deploys a network structured movement, and it was not mirroring the structure it was fighting with. Even some global justice movement elements are in this category – take a demonstration against a summit. Making a demonstration against a G8 meeting means that you understand G8 leadership as the core of world power relations at the time. So you find it crucial and decisive for all the world's power relations and existing domination structures. But you organise anarchistically, use tactics of micro politics, and attack a routine gathering of world's power-core. You are somehow like anarchistic assassins – where you kill a king but not as a soldier of an army - like an oppositional revolutionary structure, but as an individual, obviously without mirroring the dominating structure.

These movements are so close to a kind of post-anarchist, Deleuzeian way of rhizomatic organising, etc., and are against every little domination that can be detected – be it an inside movement or outside – yet, when it comes to putting a stance against world politics, you do not have a floating Empire

without a centre in these people's agenda; instead you have a clear set of countries, organisations and elites, leaders there, obvious cores of world power. It shows that when it comes to political action, activists do not insist that no power relation is reducible – even activists who explore various tactical, anarchistic principles of organisation and politics.

* * *

Nowadays, it is so common to see someone condemning animosity or anger. Whatever you do, you are expected to do it in a normal, civilised mood. Don't lose your temper, don't hate the evil. Don't nail the Satan. Calmly, vote against the Satan. Or better, despise voting, and demonstrate against Satan, very rationally. Know your reasons well, keep your arguments strong, measure your methods well, and do not make anything you haven't planned before. Don't bring delirium to the stage. Don't create a scene when it is not collectively decided to create one.

But then, how will we deal with the history of worldwide resistances, revolutions, revolts, insurrections? A strong element of anger has always been central in all of those. Passionate subjects, obsessive moments, sacrifice, regret, grief, all kinds of emotions – not only affirmative ones.

Clutching on to an affirmative perspective does not require turning into affirmative robots. Politics is full of people in anger. Transforming the world is an idea full of all kinds of emotions. Angry women, angry men, angry queers, angry children, angry elders, all are welcome in a resistance. Resistance, insurrection, a new world, a better world, transforming the world, are not really projects of social engineers, calm planners, but they are ideas coming from life moments where pain was dominant.

Maybe we need an affirmation of anger. An affirmation of anger, insurgence, resistance, denial. 'Enough is enough' is an affirmation of resistance. In whatever form. Anger is not despair. It is not depression. It is not envy or jealousy. Affirmation became an anti-political tool today. Neo-liberal discourse prefers affirmative language to the language of negation. Advertisements are affirmative. They may be based on jealousy but they are not based on anger.

1 This text is shorter and partially differently structured version of the text "Nietzsche, Post-Anarchism and the Senses", first published at *Siyahi* magazine, no 7, Spring 2006, Istanbul.

2 "Postanarchism in a Nutshell", Jason Adams, <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=03/11/11/1642242>, accessed on 15 / 11/ 2007.

3 Especially see Chapter 4 ("Utopian Socialism Then...") in Richard J. F. Day, *Gramsci is Dead, Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*, Pluto Press, London 2005.

4 For the pananarchist manifesto see Paul Avrich's *Anarchism in the Russian Revolution*, Thames and Hudson, 1973.

Postanarchismus im deutschsprachigen Raum

Jürgen Mümken

Mindestens seit den 1990er Jahren gibt es eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Poststrukturalismus aus anarchistischer Perspektive. Seit einigen Jahren wird diese Auseinandersetzung – vor allem im angloamerikanischen Sprachraum – unter dem Label „Postanarchismus“ zusammengefasst. Beim „Postanarchismus“ geht es um eine Aktualisierung anarchistischer Theorie und Praxis in der Postmoderne. Dabei geht es weder um *einen* Anarchismus, der in *einer* Beziehung zu *einer* Postmoderne steht, noch um eine Anpassung an einem so genannten Zeitgeist. Innerhalb der gegenwärtigen anarchistischen Debatte sollte es darum gehen, die gesellschaftlichen Transformationen der letzten Jahrzehnte, die neuen Erkenntnisse und gesellschaftlichen Diskurse und die Erfahrungen aus der Praxis kritisch zu reflektieren und in die anarchistische Theorie und Praxis einzubinden. Der Postanarchismus versteht sich als *ein* Teil dieser notwendigen Auseinandersetzung. Der Postanarchismus will keine Totalität darstellen, er versteht sich nicht als eine einheitliche Theorie, sondern umfasst wie der Poststrukturalismus, der Postfeminismus, der Postmarxismus und der Postoperaismus eine ganze Reihe von unterschiedlichen theoretischen Ansätzen und Auseinandersetzungen.

Der postanarchistische Diskurs im deutschsprachigen Raum

Innerhalb der anarchistischen Debatte im deutschen Sprachraum spielte der Begriff des „Postanarchismus“ keine bedeutende Rolle. Im November 2005 wurde die Seite postanarchismus.net ins Netz gestellt, die den Begriff des „Postanarchismus“ einer breiteren anarchistischen Öffentlichkeit bekannt machte. Dies heißt aber nicht, dass die Diskussionen, die anderswo unter dem Label „Postanarchismus“ zusammengefasst werden, nicht auch hier stattfanden und stattfinden. Nicht alle, die sich im deutschen Sprachraum aus anarchistischer Perspektive mit poststrukturalistischen und postmodernen Ansätzen und Theorien auseinandersetzen und für eine Aktualisierung anarchistischer Theorie und Praxis benutzen wollen, finden sich im dem Label „Postanarchismus“ wieder. Es gibt aus diesem Kreis eine anarchistische

Kritik am Postanarchismus, doch dazu später mehr. Wenn ich jetzt den postanarchistischen Diskurs im deutschsprachigen Raum und seine Entwicklung nachzuzeichnen versuche, sind die oben genannten Einschränkungen zu beachten, dass sich nicht alle AutorInnen – wie etwa Jens Kastner, Torsten Bewernitz und Gabriel Kuhn – als PostanarchistInnen sehen und begreifen.

Die Auseinandersetzung mit poststrukturalistischen und postmodernen Theorien innerhalb des deutschsprachigen Anarchismus ist ein eigenständiger Diskurs, der unabhängig und ohne Einfluss des angloamerikanischen Postanarchismus in den 1990er Jahren entstanden ist, auch wenn die meisten Texte und Bücher erst nach 2000 veröffentlicht wurden. Bis jetzt ist noch kein Buch aus dem angloamerikanischen Sprachraum ins Deutsche übersetzt worden. Erst im Jahre 2008 erscheint der Sammelband *Neuer Anarchismus in den USA. Seattle und die Folgen* – herausgegeben von Gabriel Kuhn –, der verschiedene Beiträge von verschiedenen anarchistischen Ansätzen in deutscher Übersetzung beinhaltet.

Einer der ersten – wenn nicht der erste – Beitrag war der Artikel *Keine Macht für Niemand* (vgl. Mümken 1998), der in der anarchistischen Zeitschrift *Schwarzer Faden* erschien. Der Artikel verstand sich als einen ersten Versuch der anarchistischen Aneignung des philosophischen Projektes von Michel Foucault und in erster Linie seiner Macht-Analyse. Diese bedeutet demnach für den Anarchismus, dass eine „anarchistische Gesellschaft [...] keine Gesellschaft [ist], die durch die Abwesenheit von Macht gekennzeichnet ist, sondern die Ordnung einer anarchistischen Gesellschaft ist darauf ausgelegt, daß sich aus umkehrbaren Machtverhältnisse keine starren Herrschaftszustände entwickeln“ (Mümken 1998, 45). Ebenso wird in dem Artikel die Ansicht vertreten, das die Dekonstruktion von Derrida im Sinne einer „anarchischen Subjektivität“ eine wichtige Praxis des Anarchismus sein/werden sollte: „Dekonstruktiver Anarchismus soll keine neue anarchistische Strömung sein, sondern eine Form anarchi(sti)schen Denkens mit weitreichenden Konsequenzen im dem Umgang mit den herrschenden Kategorien und Begriffen“ (Mümken 1998, 45).

In dem Buch *Freiheit, Individualität und Subjektivität* (vgl. Mümken 2003) habe ich mich mit dem Staat und das Subjekt in der Postmoderne auseinandergesetzt. In den Schlussbemerkungen zu dem Buch habe ich bemerkt: „Diese Arbeit handelte in erster Linie vom „Staat“ und vom „Subjekt“, andere Herrschaftsverhältnisse wie z.B. Rassismus, Patriarchat und Kapitalismus wurden entweder gar nicht oder nur am Rande behandelt, sind aber nicht weniger bedeutsam. Die poststrukturalistische Werkzeugkiste eignet sich ebenfalls für die Analyse patriarchaler und rassistischer Herrschaftsverhältnisse ausgezeichnet. Die Auseinandersetzung mit dem „Staat“ und dem „Subjekt“ sollte den Blick dafür schärfen, dass wir als AnarchistInnen uns nicht auf den Staat fixieren sollten. Der Staat ist nicht der Ursprung der Herrschaft

und mit dem Verschwinden des Staates verschwindet nicht automatisch Ausbeutung und Unterdrückung. Gerade die neoliberale Entstaatlichung, die wir gerade erleben, bedeutet ja nicht den Abbau von Herrschaft, sondern nur deren Privatisierung und Neuformierung“ (Mümken 2003, 277). Der Anarchismus muss, „nicht nur jede Form der Staatlichkeit und der damit verbundenen Subjektivierungsweisen bekämpfen, sondern Perspektiven einer anarchistischen Individualität und Subjektivität in der Gegenwart eröffnen. Die Formierung einer anarchistischen Subjektivität verstehe ich als Anarchie als Lebenskunst und Selbstverhältnis. Innerhalb anarchistischer Gesellschaften müssen demnach erst neue Formen der Subjektivität und Individualität hervorgebracht werden, die eine anarchistische – d.h. eine auf Freiheit ausgerichtete – Individualität ermöglichen. Es geht dabei um Formen, die frau/mann ihrem und seinem Leben selbst gibt, damit dessen Gestaltung nicht dem Zugriff der herrschenden Normen überlassen wird. [...] Es geht nicht darum, dem Menschen eine bestimmte Form von Subjektivität und Individualität – um ihrer/seiner Freiheit willen – aufzuzwingen“ (Mümken 2003, 244).

Ein wichtiger Autor für die anarchistische Auseinandersetzung in der Postmoderne ist Jens Kastner. Im Jahre 2000 erschien sein Buch *Politik und Postmoderne* über die libertären Aspekte in der Soziologie Zygmunt Baumanns – der im „angloamerikanischen Postanarchismus“ keine Rolle spielt. Für Bauman ist das Wesensmerkmal der Moderne die Schaffung von Ordnung, diese Ordnung bringt zwangsläufig auch Ambivalenz hervor, die aber eigentlich durch die Moderne aufgehoben werden sollte. Durch Ein- und Ausschlusshandlungen sollen diese Ambivalenzen bekämpft werden. Die Postmoderne ist eine Reflexion der Moderne, die die Grundannahmen und das Ordnungsraster der Moderne grundsätzlich und radikal in Frage stellt. Die moderne Ordnung gerät aus den Fugen. Kastner stellt jetzt die Analyse und Konsequenzen von Bauman an verschiedene Fragestellungen dar: die Kritik Baumans am Nationalstaat, seine Analysen und Auffassungen zu Rassismus (das Thema des Fremden), Postmoderne und Subjekt und die Frage nach einer „postmodernen Ethik“, der sich die Frage nach einer „postmodernen Politik“ anschließt. Wobei Kastner nicht bei Bauman stehen bleibt, sondern dann wenn seine Analysen und Auffassungen zu kurz greifen, greift Kastner auf Foucault und poststrukturalistische Ansätze des Feminismus und des „Postkolonialismus“ (Homi K. Bhabha, Stuart Hall) zurück. In *Politik und Postmoderne* will Kastner einen Einblick in das soziologische Denken Zygmunt Baumanns gewähren und eine Weiterentwicklung anarchistischer Theorie betrieben werden. Kastner geht es nicht um eine Abkehr von „klassischen Anarchismus“, sondern darum poststrukturalistische und postmoderne Theorien für diese Weiterentwicklung zu nutzen.

Daneben setzt sich Kastner in seinen Schriften auch immer wieder mit dem Zapatismus auseinander (vgl. Kastner 2006 und 2007). Für Kastner ist das

EZLN (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) eine „transnationale Guerilla“, denn „die Zapatistas dekonstruieren auch den Internationalismus früherer Zeiten: Dekonstruktion meint hier einerseits das Festhalten an der zentralen Bedeutung der Solidarität für emanzipatorische Kämpfe, andererseits aber die Verabschiedung von deren Bezug auf den Nationalstaat: Statt zwischen den Nationen oder ‚Völkern‘ zu denken und zu praktizieren (inter-, Lat.: zwischen), ging es nun konzeptionell wie real über beide hinaus (trans-, Lat.: über, jenseits)“ (Kastner 2007, 27). In dem Buch *Transnationale Guerilla* beschäftigt sich Kastner mit John Holloway, Zygmunt Bauman und Giorgio Agamben, da bei ihnen „Kollektivität zu einem Kriterium anti-neoliberaler Politik (Kastner 2006, 4). Das Buch handelt von kollektiven politischen Ansprüchen in einer individualisierten und individualistischen Gesellschaft.

Torsten Bewernitz beschäftigt sich in *Klasse[n] von Gewicht* mit den Problemen des Klassenkampfes in der Postmoderne aus anarchosyndikalistischer Perspektive. „Das Hauptproblem einer Differenz zwischen Anarchosyndikalismus und postmodernen Ansätzen sehe ich in der von den anarchosyndikalistischen Gewerkschaften und Gewerkschaftsinitiativen betriebenen Identitätspolitik bzgl. Klassen, die einem postmodernen Ansatz entgegenzustehen scheint“ (Bewernitz 2005, 64). Bewernitz will in diesem Aufsatz zeigen, dass dem nicht so sein muss und bezieht sich dabei auf Foucault, Derrida und Butler. Er stellt die Frage, ob Klassen auch queeren können und formuliert im Anschluss an Butler: „Der Kommunismus braucht die Klassen, er muss aber nicht wissen, was das ist“ (Bewernitz 2005, 89). Daneben befürwortet daneben eine Neulektüre der Marxschen Texte, da „es schon in diesen Texten um die Auflösung der Klassengesellschaft ging, also um eine Dekonstruktion der Klassen und damit letztendlich auch des Klassenbegriffes“ (Bewernitz 2005, 90). „Der Kommunismus“, so Bewernitz, „ist seit Mark die Dekonstruktion der Klassen. Undekonstruierbar ist nach Derrida die Gerechtigkeit“ (Bewernitz 2005, 92).

Ein weiterer wichtiger Autor, der sich intensiv mit dem Poststrukturalismus beschäftigt hat, ist Gabriel Kuhn. Seine Bücher *Tier-Werden*, *Schwarz-Werden*, *Frau-Werden* und *Jenseits von Staat und Individuum* sind zwar erst in den letzten Jahren erschienen, aber die ursprünglichen Texte dazu, wurden schon Mitte der 1990er Jahre verfasst.

Jede soziale Bewegung, die die herrschenden Verhältnisse, zum Wackeln bringen will, braucht eine geeignete theoretische Werkzeugkiste zur Kritik gegenwärtiger Gesellschaften. Der Poststrukturalismus bietet eine Reihe von Werkzeugen zur Analyse verschiedener Herrschaftsverhältnisse. In seinem Buch *Tier-Werden*, *Schwarz-Werden*, *Frau-Werden* stellt uns Gabriel Kuhn diese Werkzeuge in Form einer Einführung in die politische Philosophie des Poststrukturalismus vor. Gabriel Kuhn will eine Hilfestellung zum Ver-

ständnis poststrukturalistischer Theoriebildung und ihrer revolutionären Potentiale, sowie zur Entfaltung eigener revolutionärer Theorie und Praxis geben. Die radikale Umwälzung der herrschenden Verhältnisse ist das Ziel des Poststrukturalismus: „Viele Gedanken tragen dabei anarchistische Züge; diese werden in dem, was ich schreibe bestimmend sein. [...] Was die PoststrukturalistInnen wollen, ist der Kampf gegen Herrschaft und Autorität und die Erfahrung aktiver, lebendiger, intensiver, ungebundener und beherrschender Lebensformen“ (Kuhn 2005, 113). Den PoststrukturalistInnen geht es nicht um die „richtige Linie“ revolutionärer Politik oder um eine fixierte Vorstellung des herrschaftsfreien Lebens. Sie suchen kein ursprüngliches Ideal und wollen kein „Zurück zu ...“! Genau darin liegt ein Aspekt des herrschaftsfreien Denkens des Poststrukturalismus. Kuhn stellt vor diesem Grund alternativen Lebensformen und revolutionären Widerstand vor.

In *Jenseits von Staat und Individuum* rekonstruiert Gabriel Kuhn den neuzeitlichen Individualismus und das Verhältnis von Staat und Individuum. Gegen den neuzeitlichen Individualismus setzt er auf eine „antiindividualistische Individualität“.

Das Auftauchen des Individuums sollte den Menschen aus den verschiedenen Abhängigkeiten nach und nach befreien, doch diese Sichtweise ist zu einfach. Das neuzeitliche Individuum hat die „Einzelnen eingesperrt, anstatt sie zu befreien, und das, was als ‚Befreiung‘ übrig bleibt, ist tatsächlich eine Freisetzung“ (Kuhn 2007a, 39). Durch diese Freisetzung findet eine Zerstörung sozialer Kollektivität statt. So wird aus dem Individuum eine Gefängnis des Einzelnen oder in den Worten von Foucault, „dass die Macht des Staates [...] ein zugleich individualisierende und totalisierende Form der Macht ist“ (zitiert nach: Kuhn 2007a, 47). Individualisierung bedeutet nicht Freiheit und Individualität sondern ist Bedingung staatlicher Totalität. „Individuum und Staat bedingen sich gegenseitig: wo die eine Idee auftaucht, ist die andere nicht fern“ (Kuhn 2007a, 48). Das Individuum verdammt den Menschen dazu ein isolierter Einzelner zu sein. Der Einzelne wird zu einem vom Staat kontrolliertem und verwaltetem Individuum. Das Individuum besitzt nicht wie der Einzelne eine freie Individualität, sondern ist das Ergebnis von Individualisierung und Homogenisierung. Der Staat hasst die Heterogenität die Menge, die Multitude, er liebt die Homogenität, er homogenisiert die Multitude zum Volk, das er besser beherrschen kann. So stellen unkontrollierte Gruppe eine Bedrohung für den Staat dar, „weil sie für nicht-staatliche Formen sozialer Zusammenhänge steht“ (Kuhn 2007a, 51).

Dies heißt für Kuhn, dass eine konsequente Kritik am neuzeitlichen Individualismus anti-bourgeoise Lebensformen einfordern muss. Mit Foucault gesprochen, müssen wir neue Formen der Subjektivität hervorbringen, indem wir die Art von Individualität, die man uns jahrhundertlang auferlegt hat, zurückweisen. Auch in einer zukünftigen freien Gesellschaft löst sich die

Frage der Individualität und ihr Verhältnis zur Gemeinschaft nicht in Luft auf, so bemerkt Kuhn, „das den Einzelnen in einer kollektiven Lebensgemeinschaft ein Wert zukommen muss, der gerade in ihrer Individualität besteht, und das deshalb eine antiindividualistische Gruppe nicht kein Verständnis von Individualität braucht, sondern ein antiindividualistisches“ (Kuhn 2007a, 90). Es geht Kuhn um eine Individualität und Kollektivität jenseits von Staat und verstaatlichtem Individuum. Das Ziel muss eine antiindividualistische Kollektivität sein, in der die Individualität des Einzelnen seinen Raum bekommt. So will die antiindividualistische Praxis nach Kuhn „nicht die Befreiung des Individuums vom Staat, sondern sie richtet sich gegen die Erzeugung des Individuums durch den Staat“ (Kuhn 2007a, 105). Nach der Rekonstruktion des Individuums hat Kuhn die antiindividualistische Individualität skizziert, dabei ist er der Frage nach der Individualpolitik nachgegangen und hat sich auf der Suche nach Kollektivität gemacht, am Ende kommt heraus: „... der Staat bleibt der Feind. Und das Individuum sowieso“ (Kuhn 2007a, 158).

Anarchistische Kritik am Postanarchismus

„Die Angst, mit der Vorsilbe ‚Post-‘ alle Errungenschaften des sich daran Anschließenden für endgültig vorüber und die damit verbundenen Ansprüche für überholt zu erklären, hatte auch schon die Debatte um die Postmoderne begründet“ (Lubin 2007, 13). Diese Angst ist aber überflüssig: Der Postanarchismus hält an den anarchistischen Zielen und Utopien fest.

Immer wenn neue Ideen, Diskurse und Theorien auftauchen, gibt es selbstverständlich und notwendigerweise auch eine Kritik daran. Kritik ist ein wesentliches Instrument zur Weiterentwicklung von Utopien, Theorien und Praxisformen, wo es keine Kritik gibt, herrscht Stillstand. Zu den Kritikern gehört Gabriel Kuhn, obwohl er von poststrukturalistischer Theorie beeinflusst ist (vgl. Kuhn 2005), kritisiert er in seinem Aufsatz *Bakunin vs. Postanarchismus* den angloamerikanischen Postanarchismus, da er wenig von dem Begriff „Postanarchismus“ hält. Kuhn sieht den Postanarchismus wesentlich als Label – „als Marke, die hilft, eine bestimmte Form Theorie zu verkaufen“ (Kuhn 2007b, 165). So wirft er auch dem Postanarchismus eine „Verakademisierung anarchistischen Denkens“ (Kuhn 2007b, 160) vor, dem er einen Anarchismus als Bewegung repräsentiert von Bakunin gegenüberstellen will.

Kuhn sieht im Postanarchismus eher eine neu benannte als neu geschaffene Theorie, denn so Kuhn: „Der Poststrukturalismus selbst hat diese Aufgabe als implizit anarchistische Denkbewegung bereits geleistet. Es braucht dazu keinen Postanarchismus“ (Kuhn 2007, 164b). Es sollte bei dieser Kritik aber bedacht werden, dass sich der Postfeminismus, Postmarxismus und Post-

operaismus ebenfalls auf den Poststrukturalismus beziehen bzw. diesen aneignen. Aus diesem Grund ist eine Einverleibung des Poststrukturalismus in den Anarchismus problematisch. Bewernitz schreibt zu dieser Problematik: „Das darf aber nicht bedeuten, die unter ‚postmodern‘ subsumierten TheoretikerInnen für den Anarchismus zu vereinnahmen. Aus anarchistischer Sicht kann es nur bedeuten, mit den Thesen und/oder Erkenntnissen dieser TheoretikerInnen die Anarchismen zu bereichern und sie damit einer veränderten gesellschaftlichen Situation anzupassen“ (Bewernitz 2005, 63). Der Poststrukturalismus sollte vielmehr als eine Werkzeugkiste betrachtet werden, aus dem sich der Anarchismus bedienen kann und sollte.

Eine weitere Kritik von Kuhn ist die „postanarchistische Lesart Bakunins“ (Kuhn 2007b, 160) innerhalb des angloamerikanischen Raumes. Für Kuhn wird Bakunin im (angloamerikanischen) Postanarchismus zu einem Strohmännchen aufgebaut, „um einen ‚alten‘, ‚überholten‘, essentialistischen‘ Anarchismus zu repräsentieren, den zu überwinden die Postanarchisten sich zur Aufgabe gemacht haben“ (Kuhn 2007b, 170).

Fazit

Ich denke, dass deutlich geworden ist, wobei es in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Poststrukturalismus im deutschsprachigen Raum geht, um die Aktualisierung der anarchistischen Theorie und Praxis. Der Anarchismus soll fit sein für das 21. Jahrhundert, es soll sich aber keine neue Strömung innerhalb des Anarchismus herausbilden. Der Poststrukturalismus soll den verschiedenen Strömungen des Anarchismus als Werkzeugkasten dienen um so neue Wege in Richtung freier Gesellschaft eröffnen. „Postanarchismus“ kann demnach nur als „Label“ innerhalb des anarchistischen Diskurses betrachtet werden.

Literatur

Bewernitz, Torsten: Klasse[n] von Gewicht. Probleme des Klassenkampfes in der Postmoderne. In: Mümken, Jürgen (Hrsg.): Anarchismus in der Postmoderne. Beiträge zur anarchistischen Theorie und Praxis, Frankfurt am Main 2005

Kastner, Jens: Politik und Postmoderne. Libertäre Aspekte in der Soziologie Zygmunt Baumanns, Münster 2000

Kastner, Jens: Autorität, Verhältnis, Effekt gegen Repräsentation und Gewaltmonopol. Anarchistisches Staatsverständnis unter neoliberalen Bedingungen. In: Mümken, Jürgen (Hrsg.): Anarchismus in der Postmoderne. Beiträge zur anarchistischen Theorie und Praxis, Frankfurt am Main 2005

Kastner, Jens: Rebellion, Revolte und Revolution überdenken. In: Holloway,

John: Die zwei Zeiten der Revolution. Würde, Macht und die Politik der Zapatistas, Wien 2006

Kastner, Jens: Transnationale Guerilla. Aktivismus, Kunst und die kommende Gemeinschaft, Münster 2007

Kuhn, Gabriel: Tier-Werden, Schwarz-Werden, Frau-Werden. Eine Einführung in die politische Philosophie des Postrukturalismus, Münster 2005

Kuhn, Gabriel: Jenseits von Staat und Individuum. Individualität und autonome Politik, Münster 2007a

Kuhn, Gabriel: Bakunin vs. Postanarchismus. In: Bakunin Almanach, Band 1. Hrsg. von Bernd Kramer und Wolfgang Eckhardt, Berlin 2007b

Kuhn, Gabriel (Hrsg.): Neuer Anarchismus in den USA. Seattle und die Folgen, Münster 2008

Lubin, Oskar: Postanarchismus. Der klassische Anarchismus ist nicht passé, bedarf aber angesichts theoretischer Entwicklungen und veränderter Verhältnisse einiger Revisionen. Eine Skizze. In: graswurzelrevolution Nr. 318 - 04/2007

Mümken, Jürgen: Keine Macht für Niemand. Versuch einer anarchistischen Aneignung des philosophischen Projektes von Michel Foucault. In: Schwarzer Faden Nr. 63 - 1/1998

Mümken, Jürgen: Freiheit und anarchistische Subjektivität. In: R. Raasch / H.J. Degen (Hrsg.): Die richtige Idee für eine falsche Welt, Berlin 2002

Mümken, Jürgen: Freiheit, Individualität und Subjektivität. Staat und Subjekt in der Postmoderne aus anarchistischer Perspektive, Frankfurt am Main 2003

Mümken, Jürgen: Bakunin und die Autorität. In: Bakunin Almanach, Band 1. Hrsg. von Bernd Kramer und Wolfgang Eckhardt, Berlin 2007

This text is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 Serbia license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/deed.sr>

Interview with Activists of Freedom Fight

Interview by Andrej Grubačić

If you could first introduce Freedom Fight to ZNet readers, and then give us something of the socio-political background of contemporary Serbia. I have just been reading the latest UNICEF report, according to which there are over 300,000 children today who are living in poverty or are at risk of poverty. These kinds of things were unimaginable 15 years ago. They were, dare I say it, unimaginable not only in the times of Yugoslav state-socialism, but also in the times of Slobodan Milosevic's kleptocratic regime. It seems that neoliberal, modern and European Serbia demonstrates certain atavistic social traits. Serbia is now considered to be "the last Balkan state". Balkan is still considered to be a permanent and natural powder keg of Europe, pacified by the international capitalist community, a region that is, as Richard Holbrooke pointed out, "too complicated (and trivial) for outsiders to master". How does an anarchist feel living and fighting in this "strange and feral Balkans" (Simon Winchester)?

FreedomFight is an anarchist, alter-globalist movement created in Serbia in 2003. Beside work on alternative web-based media project at www.freedomfight.net, publishing Balkans' edition of Z magazine, Freedom Fight movement through work with workers and underclass, promotes necessity of opposing neo-liberal ideology. But that's not all, we are not just reaction to the unjust system, we also try to seek for proper alternatives for the life after capitalism. We don't believe in the so called "end of the history", that better world is not possible. Their plan is, of course, to convince us in that, but "end of the history" is going to happen only if we let them destroy the planet – then for sure would not be any history no more.

First step is to fight neo-liberal ideology whose imposing here is being financed with large quantities of money. Except unmasking of promises of better life that we'll deserve by obeying orders that comes from some places far away from here, from IMF and World Bank, we have to promote alternatives which would capture people's imagination and took them away from transitional apathy and depression. We have to show people that there is better

future beyond capitalism. Of course, any alternative to the neo-liberal models must be also an alternative to the authoritarian systems.

Balkan is a place for geo-strategic experiments of powerful states. They also want by using force to convince us that they are bosses and that we have to obey orders. During NATO bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999, which could be avoided if negotiations haven't been sabotaged with unacceptable ultimatums, the result was escalation of the atrocities. We can't believe that so many intellectuals abroad supported bombing as "humanitarian intervention"! What about other places where ethnic cleansing was military aided from USA administration!? Was that also their "humanitarian intervention"! Now that criminal politics took the form of an economic type of oppression.

According to official records of unemployment, in Serbia rate of unemployment is approximately 30%. Transitional Balkan is not a very nice place to live in. People get fired, public property is being sold for nothing, and there is extremely big gap between rich and poor. Many people that call themselves "experts" are trying to convince us that we need to make some transitional sacrifices so in the future we could live like the "whole normal world". In fact, they are just well paid exponents of neoliberal ideology. They are imposing here politics which we often call "IMF copy-paste politics", because IMF is dictating always the same economic measures on no matter what transitional country. Slovenia was not in crises as long as it managed to avoid those measures that have disastrous effect on ordinary people's life. Due to the neo-liberal reforms Slovenia's social security system was cut back, public utilities were privatized and living standards for most of the population declined significantly. Serbia is also forced to conduct policies that were designed to fulfill the requirements for entry into the European Union. Elections in Serbia are often presented as most important thing for Balkan stability by international community, which is always suggesting us for who to vote. In fact, nothing depends on the final electoral outcome. No matter what political party seizes state power, the processes of privatization, transition and European integration is going to continue. Most of the despaired people who are against these processes are voting for Serbian Radical Party, which on recent election took 29% of the vote, but, in fact, that party is just a nationalist, pro-capitalist organization with fake populism.

What is the role of intellectuals in Serbia today? Does an independent, critical intellectual exist? Do they take an active part in the social movements? Or do you see only "integrated intellectuals, as late Pierre Bourdieu used to call them?

Well, we are not sure what term "intellectual" actually means... Yes, there are people who are well educated and who possess certain knowledge, but I

don't see them often raising their voice for the benefit of the underclass people. I think that at this moment Belgrade University is a neo-liberal stronghold in Serbia. Most of the professors are trying to convince us that this kind of society is inevitable. They say for themselves that they are "realistic" and that students have to pay tuition fees although all of them during their studies had free education. If you mean on Sartre's distinction between intellectual and specialist, where intellectual is the one who criticize system and who is involved in fight for social justice, and specialist the one who is expert for certain aspect of knowledge, than we have many specialist but outside of world of activism we don't see no intellectuals.

Now a difficult question. You are anarchists and anti/alter-globalists. You are against both the international community and the communitarian logic of Serbian nationalism. What is your position on the Hague Tribunal? According to the well meaning, good hearted European liberals, The Hague is the last option to tame the "wild and refractory people of Balkans. Is this Tribunal legal? Does that matter at all? Do you feel tamed and more civilized? Should anarchist support the civilizing efforts of the international community, in order for the people to achieve "reconciliation" and "collective catharsis", so they can stop being "not-yet" or "never-quite" European?

The Tribunal in The Hague is an ideological institution with disputable validity. It was created by the UN Security Council resolutions 808/93 and 827/93, but Security Council is only UN executive organ and as such it may not establish judicial organs, nor it has right to perform any judicial function.

Beside that, the other problem is the so called "selective justice". The Tribunal in The Hague prosecutes only crimes committed in a particular space, but war crimes were committed and are being committed in so many areas of the world. This selective justice also contravenes the UN Charter principle of sovereign equality of states.

The Tribunal regulates its own functioning and appears both as a legislative and as a judicial body. There are many violations of civil rights committed by this court, particularly a detention pending trial too long and the fact that there is no right to compensation of damage in case of unlawful detention.

This Tribunal has a mission to hide hands of powerful states covered with blood. Milosevic should have been tried on the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Instead, he passed away in a prison cell under unknown conditions. Bigger war criminals – Clinton, Blair, Bush – are not prosecuted.

Could you tell us a bit more about the politics from below? Yugoslavia, old state-socialist Yugoslavia, was the only nation-state with a system of self-management that has existed. Does the memory of self managed work,

grassroots democracy at the level of production, and social security still exist among the people? Who are the new protagonists of the politics from below? Is it the old Left in its various-and dull!- manifestations? The workers? The students? The peasants? Anarchists and feminists?

We met few activists abroad who had very positive opinion about self-management in Yugoslavia, but we think that such opinion that comes so often is too much idealistic. In reality that so called self-management system was controlled and coordinated by political bureaucracy and we think it is wrong to even call it self-management. It was certainly not a classless system and there certainly were authoritarian decision making. However, even self-management with those malfunctions was much better system than this one. Anyway, self-management, real self-management, must come from people and it can't be imposed on them. We can learn from mistakes of the old so called self-management system and re-invent it and improve it.

It is a bit hard to summarize all social protests against dismantling social security system that occurred during transitional years. They are best described by slogan created in Slovenia during demonstrations when more than 40.000 people participated: "For the maintenance of the welfare state". We have to mention workers of the Serbian pharmaceutical factory "Jugoremedija", from the town of Zrenjanin, who have been engaged in an ongoing struggle to run their workplace themselves, who became "symbol of resistance to neoliberal capitalism in Serbia". They also inspired struggles and factory occupations by other workers from that city. They have fought the privatization of their factory for over four years. They have occupied factory and fought with police and private army. Z magazine Balkans produced by Freedom Fight is financed by those workers in struggle. Recently students of Belgrade University occupied buildings of several faculties for seven days, until University agreed to support demands of students against tuition fees against the government. Those rebellion students now and during occupation functioned in accordance with a direct democracy decision making.

So far most of the rebellions are mainly reaction to the already imposed "structural adjustment" program of the IMF. Serbia lacks of organized prevention of those impositions. People haven't been expected such a disastrous consequences of the transitions and believed in politician's lies about better future. There is a necessity of struggling against neo-liberal measures, of offering anti-authoritarian vision of future society and of creation of united movement against capitalism. Freedom Fight is giving contribution to that by many activities especially by producing Zmag Balkans and one more booklet called 'Glas radnika' (Voice of the workers) which is more directly edited by workers themselves that work with us. As much as our means allow us we try to establish as intensive contact with underclass and workers as possible.

Zmag and `Glas radnika` should be that voice of the voiceless.

What about the Serbian Roma? Roma people are Europe's ubiquitous underclass and it's most marginalized and oppressed citizens. An open letter presented to the EU by the European Roma Rights Center on International Roma Day two years ago reminded us of the fact that "anti-Gypsyism continues to be rife, is rarely punished and is often used as an acceptable outlet of racism in mass media as well as in every aspect of life," stressing "the persistent reality of extreme poverty and systemic human rights frustration or active abuse in the Roma ghettos which requires urgent concrete action". A friend of mine, Bill Templer, on a much more optimistic note, sees Roma communities as a "laboratory for self management beyond borders". In his recent inspiring article in New Politics, he hopes that "their experience in the self-organization of a supranational identity in localized communities can help point certain directions over the longer haul for a denationalizing of Europe's political structures from the bottom up: decentralized nodes of community within a transnational frame of inventive federation."

According to Mr. Paul Polansky, an activist working for the rights of the Roma people, the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia and the violence in its aftermath have destroyed the homes and lives of the Roma of Kosovo. Albanian nationalists have thrown the Roma out of Kosovo in even greater numbers proportionately than the Serbs. Of the 150 - 200 thousand Roma of Kosovo, less than 20 thousand remain there when the NATO's "peace-keeping" forces took control of Kosovo. 15 thousand Romani homes have been destroyed. Mr. Polansky also claims that most international aid agencies in Kosovo discriminate against all minorities, especially Gypsies.

Those remaining Roma are living in UN-built refugee camps in the most degrading circumstances. Paul Polansky claims that the UN built the camps on toxic wasteland. In his book UN-led Blood he stated: "At three camps built by the UN High Commission for Refugees, some 60 Gypsy children under the age of six have been exposed to such high levels of lead that they are highly likely to die soon or to suffer irreversible brain damage. This number represents every child born in the camps since they were built five and a half years ago."

The Roma people are in little less extent also discriminated in Serbia. They are usually beaten by police or skinheads and their entrance into certain object is forbidden. They usually have more problems with local authorities than with ordinary citizens. They have difficulties to find job because of the color of their skin and they are usually allowed only to work some hard labor jobs.

But there is a place Raca Kragujevacka, hometown of one of our comrades, a small town of about 4,000, where everybody knows everybody else, where

in the summer of 1999 some 400 Roma refugees from Kosovo found shelter in the big building of our comrades' old school located in the downtown. Most of them have never heard of that town before. They were well accepted by local population and there are more and more marriages made by people of different nationality.

Here, in the United States, the myth of Serbian "OTPOR" still persists. According to the liberals, but also a number of radical leftists, they were the grassroots, directly democratic and non-violent force behind the Serbian "Black Revolution" of 2001. Could you tell us what OTPOR! really is?

Organization "Otpor", in fact, was a USA aided and trained organization. Its purpose was to overthrow Milosevic's regime and to establish a government which would be obedient to imperialistic demands. After fall of Milosevic in 2000, remains of that organization became a political party and after failure to become a part of Parliament, Otpor merge into Democratic Party. If you look official ideological declarations of Otpor, you'll see that it was a nationalist, neo-liberal organization which advocated "the restructuring of economy, creating the conditions for a free market, the inevitable privatization and opening of the economy to foreign investment backed by legal guarantees that would facilitate safe investment" (Declaration of Otpor, 1999).

What about the other seductive myth, the one of the "friendly civil society"? Are NGO's friends or foes in the process of building anti-authoritarian, left-libertarian social movements in Serbia today? My impression is that the so-called "friendly civil society" and the "advocates of human rights" have been transformed into intellectual commissars of the "modern", neoliberal political forces.

People from NGOs and those who represent so called "civil society" allow themselves to criticize certain aspects of the system, but never system itself. They are part of the system and as such they are for changes, which would never endanger the system. They are most welcomed guests of American embassy. They are well paid but they are useless. As reformist organizations they assume system maintenance and if you start questioning system, you'll have them on your back defending the system.

But how do you see the recent elections? It seems that they will effect the final decision of the status for Kosovo. The Finish fireman, Marti Ahtisaari, in the best tradition of Balkan colonial governors, after introducing his "plan" for Kosovo's "future", declared that he is not really interested in what local politicians in Serbia and Kosovo have to say about his proposal. What would be an anarchist response to the artificial dilemma of nationalism or neoliberalism, which denies a possibility for another, horizontal and

grassroots approach in this Serbian province? Is there an anarchist proposal for Kosovo?

International community now wants to solve problems that escalated after their ``humanitarian interventions``. There is analogy with Iraq – USA bombs country promising establishment of democracy and freedom and after bombing attacked country ends up in chaos. UN peacekeepers did nothing to prevent ethnic cleansing of Serbs and Roma in March of 2004. The special negotiator nominated by the UN Marti Ahtisaari strives to ``monoethnic independence`` which is opposed by Belgrade officials. Probably they will be forced to except it but any forced agreement won't do any good. In exchange for Kosovo Serbia will probably be granted with membership in European-Atlantic alliances.

As Chomsky suggested the partition of Kosovo must be seriously considered and that seems to me as the most appropriate for the time being but it should be, of course, just a temporary solution. Partitions and ethnic borders although at the moment inevitable are failure of humanity and mutual understanding.

However, multi-ethnic society can't be impose from above. Ethnic division could be avoided if we recognize that main problem is not territory and to whom it belongs but unsolved essential social problems such as poverty, housing, refugees, privatization. If society is shaped from below by social movements based on solidarity and inclusive democracy we'd be witnessing surmounting of ethnic divisions and conflicts.

And what about Montenegro?

After referendum in May 2006 Montenegro became an independent country. Montenegro's prime minister of that time, Milo Djukanović was a former ally of Slobodan Milosević but in 1997 Western powers used him to dismantle the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and to remove any obstacles to their interests in the Balkans. In return, Montenegro was bankrolled by Western financial support. Unemployment and poverty are very huge and country is ruled by ordinary criminals and cigarettes smugglers. There were many irregularities during anti-independence campaigns. Many people were forced to vote for independence and Montenegrins living abroad were allowed to vote whilst those living in Serbia were barred.

In one of my recent essays I tried to describe the phenomenon I called the "Belgrade Consensus", or the political argument which is composed of three parts: neoliberalism, nationalism, and the politics of the so called civil society (civilizing the "uncivil one"). The protagonists of this unusual consensus of elites suggest that there could be no alternative beyond mutually dependent nationalist and neoliberal discourses. In this atmosphere, the people of Serbia are deprived of a genuine alternative. They are condemned to becoming

depoliticised, to the loss of “political illusions”, to a crisis of political activism, and worse still, being receptive to those of the populist extremism of the extreme right.

Neoliberalism and nationalism are two sides of the same coin. Nationalism is as terrorism just a symptom of capitalist and colonial society. They are not oppose to each other. Capitalist society itself creates enemy it fights against. USA won't win war against terrorism even if it manage to exterminate all Al-Quaida cells. As long as exist exploitation and imperialism there will be those extreme sorts of resistance. USA should lead “war on terror” within its own borders, that is, it should change its own foreign policy which is main inciter for terrorist activities.

In Balkan nationalistic impulses were stirred up by imperialistic states so they would weaken by internal civil wars those who might opposed imperialistic plans. Beside that, here neoliberalism and nationalism are both ideologically rooted in liberalism. Between those two options differences are almost irrelevant. Both options advocate privatization, dismantling social security system, etc.

Do you think that ideas such as participatory economics, and other proposals for a participatory society, that we here at Z like to advocate, make any sense for the Balkans? Is visionary, participatory politics, which would rest on alternative political designs, and an invitation to think collectively and seriously about the life after capitalism and hierarchy, something that people in Serbia and the Balkans can relate to? In 19th century Russia and Serbia, revolutionaries used to talk about “going to the people”. Do you think that going to the people with the ideas of participatory economy and participatory politics would encounter constructive responses?

Well, idea of parecon is strictly opposed to the neo-liberal dogma so as long as advocates of neo-liberalism have power of manufacturing opinions parecon won't be accepted and familiar to ordinary people. I am sure that most activists are not acquainted with idea of parecon. Ideas that advocate that everybody have a proportionate participation in the decisions that affect people's lives must have a stronghold in part of population for whose benefit those ideas are designed. They have to be closely connected with social movements which would advocate them and establish them in practise and in reality. There is an open space for these ideas, maybe especially on Balkan. People lost faith in representative democracy and in political parties. They want to build their future and their lives on their own. I am sure they could recognize parecon as a proper alternative.

This text was published at ZNet, and updated for this issue in January 2008 by Freedom Fight (You can contact Freedom Fight at pismo@freedomfight.net)

From: GLP
Subject: Belgrade invitation
To: brener schurz
Date: Fri, 8 Sep 2006

Hello Barbara Schurz and Alexander Brener!
We slept in Vienna at Fahim Amir's place and we saw your new book "The Art of Destruction", we decided to invite you for a very interesting debate here in Belgrade on 1st October 2006. It is a debate about Anarchism and Contemporary Arts and will take place in the context of our program "Talk about Anarchism"....

From: brener schurz
Subject: Re: Belgrade invitation
To: horrorkatze GLP
Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2006

Dear GLP,

Thank you for your friendly invitation.
However, we can not fulfill your wishes because we are against any discussions, especially about anarchism. We think that the time for rational and domesticated discussions is over. All what we really want is to disturb, to negate, to be joyful and unexceptable. You know, we want to be deranged. And there is nothing joyful and deranged in buying a plane ticket to Belgrade, stay there for 3 days, meet Sezgin Boynik and give a talk to artists and activists. Contemporary artists (and activists) take their commodities where there commodities take them. But we try to escape this ugly normality.

As far as our book "The Art of Construction" is concerned: the books are all in Ljubljana and you can get as many copies as you want by contacting Miran Mohar. If you give us your postal address we will send you our new samizdat publication (in Russian) about anarchy etc. It is a beautiful book.

sincerely yours, a + b